THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXV, No. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1956

CONTENTS

Catholics of the United States of America and Protestantism in Brazil ..... *Bishop Agnelo Rossi* 145

John W. Moran, S.J. (1889-1956) ..... *John J. Collins, S.J.* 150

Mary, Queen of Wisdom ..... *T. M. Sparks, O.P.* 153

The Pope's Teaching on Organic Transplantation *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 159

Lea, Coulton, and Anti-Catholicism. Part I ..... *John E. Coogan, S.J.* 171

Towards an Adequate Theological Treatise *De Ecclesia* ..... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 183

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., and Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm.

Delegated Surgical Procedures 198

Religious Instruction in Our Public Schools 199

Chalice Interior 201

Rose-Colored Vestments 202

Benediction Problems 202

Funeral Mass, When Permitted? 203

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1956, by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Preceding Page*)

Altar Decorations 203
Requiem or Votive Mass 204
Interior of Metal Tabernacle 204
The Religious Confessor and Candidates for Orders 205
Witnesses for Marriage 205
Scapular Faculties Again 206
Daily Office in the Vernacular 206
Number of Beads for a Rosary 207
Baptism of Infants 207

ANALECTA
Review of Recent Roman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 208

BOOK REVIEWS
Concept of Freedom, *edited by Carl W. Grindel, C.M.* 213
The Call of the Cloister, *by Peter F. Anson* 214

SON OF THE CHURCH
Rev. Louis Lochet
Activity in the Church, purification in the Church, contemplation in the Church, these are the elements of apostolic spirituality upon which the author reflects.
Just released $4.50

MENTAL HEALTH In CHILDHOOD
Dr. Charles Burns
A prominent Catholic psychiatrist writes a popular book on the mental health of children.
Just released $2.75

Fides Publishers Chicago 19, Illinois
At all bookstores

To Those Interested in The Catholic Encyclopedia

For nearly six years we have been publishing sections of a loose-leaf Supplement II thus, in some measure, helping to bring the Work up to date.

For a longer period reprints of the Original set have been issued at intervals of a year or so.

Because of the heavy expense involved, the printings are limited to a figure for which sales can be obtained sufficient to meet the printer's and binder's bills. These call for cash payments by the time manufacture is completed.

A new supply will be ready, early next year.

Price $137.50 plus postage and packing. Included are seventeen original volumes plus six sections and two binders of Supplement II.

The Gilmary Society
A Membership Corporation
30 West 16th Street,
New York 11, N. Y.

CATHOLICS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND PROTESTANTISM IN BRAZIL

Brazil is the Latin country where Protestantism has expanded most rapidly. In Brazil there are more Protestants than in the whole of Latin Europe; it has a Protestant population equal to that of the rest of Latin America, and exactly double the number of Protestants who are spread in all the other Latin countries of South America. Half of the two million Protestants in Brazil are active members of their sects.

Today Brazil is the country of the world in which Protestant leaders place their hope for the future, not only because of the rapid Protestant expansion, but also, and mainly, because of the fidelity to the fundamentalist Protestant doctrines and the proselytizing spirit of their followers.

This proselytism had its beginning with the coming of the first North American missionaries in 1859, as before that date there was only the colonial type of Protestantism: Anglicans and German Lutherans who dedicated themselves only to members of their community.

In connection with the centenary in Brazil of many sects of North American origin in 1959, many big commemorations are being planned with the cooperation of the mother churches in the U. S. A.

We think it reasonable therefore to let North American Catholics know the real situation of Protestantism in Brazil in order that they may be able to make a right judgment on the matter; and we think it necessary, because we know that in Latin America many mistakes are made when judging the religious situation of the U. S. A., because of improper generalizations.

The following facts should be noted:

(1) With only few reservations, the thesis is already out of date that North American Protestantism is an instrument of political imperialism of the U. S. A. In spite of considerable emphasis given to the power of the dollar, to attribute the prosperity of Protestantism exclusively to this economic reason, is, no doubt, to go too far.

In Brazil the Protestant churches (80 per cent of which have Brazilian pastors) support themselves in ordinary activities by contributions of their members. The dollar comes from other societies

for extraordinary activities, like free distribution of the Bible (90 per cent of the deficit of the Brazilian Biblical Society was covered by the English and North American Biblical Societies), the missions (opening of new fields given to the direction of North American missionaries which will become in future time economically self sufficient), and contributions to build schools and hospitals.

The reason for the extraordinary expansion of Protestantism in Brazil is explained not merely by the power of the dollar, but mainly by the religious ignorance of our people and the proselytizing zeal of the Protestants.

(2) Although it is not openly said, some Latin American Catholic leaders expect substantial help from the American Bishops as a kind of compensation, as if in a way the North American hierarchy were responsible for the proselytizing effort of the Protestant missionaries in Latin America.

It is obvious that the solution of our problems must depend mainly on our own zeal. We think, however, that we may hope for the fraternal co-operation of the North American Catholics, as we will explain.

(3) In Brazil (what cannot be said of Argentina for instance) the U. S. is looked on with great sympathy, and Brazilian Catholics who visit your country come back very well impressed with the Catholic life there (which generally does not happen with the Protestants who visit their brethren, excepting the Mormons). Therefore, the Good Neighbor policy is accepted by our people. The only considerable objection to the development of this Pan-American unity is the fear of an intensification of Protestant proselytism among us.

One reason, among others, for this preoccupation is the ever-growing number of students to whom scholarships are given. Of the 507 Brazilian students who received scholarships and are presently in the U. S., only 30 are studying in Catholic universities.

Latin American Catholics want the Catholic Church, the true link of union in America, to have an important role in Pan-American unity. They also want the people of the U. S. to understand this reality: we shall be good friends and good neighbors as long as our Catholic tradition is respected.

(4) Our psychology is different. Our historical, social and religious situation is altogether different. Many North Americans are

unaware of the methods used by the Protestants, including North American Protestants, in order to uproot the Catholic faith from the hearts of our people—methods marked by falsehood and bad faith. Catholic North American missionaries here are often amazed by the intolerance and boldness of many Protestant North American missionaries, as they are not like the Protestants they are used to in the U. S. Some facts that seem to show an inquisitional intolerance by Latin American Catholics, which give a bad impression to North Americans, are merely falsifications by the Protestants or the reaction of Catholics in the face of Protestant attacks.

In Brazil the Catholics are generally very tolerant, but they want their religious beliefs respected.

(5) With the closing of the missions in China—the classical field for North American Protestants—many missionaries are being sent to Latin America, especially to Brazil. In Campinas (Sao Paulo) alone, there are usually fifty missionaries learning Portuguese in order to preach later in different parts of Brazil.

(6) Lately Protestant industrial organizations are employing their capital in Brazil. Among them we notice "Le Tourneau" with a large plant of colonization in the Xingu region, similar to its operation in Peru.

The Mormons are also spending a great deal of money in their chapels and centers as well as in other works of co-operativism like those they have in Utah.

(7) Brazil, since 1953, is the second country in the world in the distribution of Protestant Bibles, the first being the U. S. A. And the portions of the Bible distributed (1,600,000 copies in 1953) were almost all printed in the U. S. A.

(8) There are already in Brazil a good number of North American Catholic missionaries (Redemptorists and Franciscans mainly). Their work has been very good and has compensated in a way for Protestant propaganda.

(9) Having these considerations in view, let us make some practical recommendations for a considerable interchange of Brazilian Catholics and their brethren of the U. S. A., possibly through the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

(A) We must know each other better, and for this purpose, it would be a great advantage for Catholic speakers (North Americans or Brazilians who know the U. S. A.) to speak to Brazilians about

the life and organization of the Catholic Church in the U. S. A., and for Brazilians or others who are familiar with our problems to speak in the U. S. A. about the religious situation in Brazil, with our great needs and potentialities.

(B) There is an urgent need to increase the number of scholarships awarded by Catholic universities. There should be an exchange with the Brazilian Catholic universities.

(C) There is available in the U. S. A. much Biblical, liturgical and catechetical material which could also be printed in Brazil with the text in Portuguese.

(D) In the first week of Apologetic Studies in Bogota (January, 1955) in which I represented Brazil, the Protestant problem in Latin America was discussed and it was decided that we should give free rights for publication and translation of all literature in reference to the defense of faith and morals, in all Latin America. It is obvious that such a concession in the U. S. would bring great benefits to our work.

(E) It would be great profit for the National Catholic Welfare Conference to give to the experts on Protestantism in Latin America facilities to study the mother sects in the U. S. (especially since the national Protestant leaders in Latin America have studied in the U. S. A.); to establish comparisons with the sects in their countries; and to refute objections and assertions which only with a study *in loco* we will be able to do. Better than any others, these experts could also observe the methods and processes of the Catholic Church in the U. S. and learn up to what point these methods can be used in their countries.

(F) It is obvious that a larger number of North American Catholic missionaries and nuns would be a great help to Brazil, extremely in need of clergy. A period of adaptation to the country, to its language and its customs—as the Protestants have—will enlarge the capacity of these missionaries and help them to avoid some little difficulties with our Latin American mentality.

(G) The expansion of Pan-American interchange by means of Catholicism, which we insist is the most powerful and best link of union in America, may some day influence the choice or at least the attitude of diplomatic representatives of the U. S. A. in Latin American nations. Although the North American government maintains neutrality in the religious question, the members of the diplo-

matic body in Latin America do not always maintain the same attitude in their private behavior.

(H) Finally this interchange would give to Brazilians and Latin Americans a wonderful impression of the power of North American Catholicism and the discord and confusion of the Protestant churches. It is certain that such a mental attitude would be a powerful antidote against Protestant propaganda, which explains all the glories of the U. S. A. by Protestantism.

The National Committee of Defense of Moral and Faith, in its section of Vigilance of the Protestant Expansion in Brazil, under my direction, is deeply interested in beginning this interchange with the Church in North America.

✠Agnelo Rossi
Bishop of Barra do Piraí
Estado do Rio de Janeiro
Brazil

JOHN W. MORAN, S.J. (1889-1956)

Father John W. Moran, S.J., author of two theological volumes and a regular contributor to *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* was born March 30, 1889 in East Granville, Vt. After preliminary studies in the high school at Waterbury, Vt., he entered Holy Cross College, from which he was graduated in 1910 with the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Entering the Society of Jesus in 1911, he completed his classical studies at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and his philosophy at Woodstock, Md. As a scholastic, he taught four years at Holy Cross College (1917-1921), returning to Woodstock for theology and ordination. There followed two years of postgraduate work for the degree of Doctor of Theology at the Gregorian University, Rome. Upon his return to America he took a course in ascetical theology at Poughkeepsie and was then appointed professor of theology in Jesuit Seminary, Weston College, Weston, Mass., a position to which he devoted the remaining twenty-eight years of his life.

As a teacher, Father Moran was exceptionally conversant with recent theological and scriptural literature. He had a zest for controversy and a thorough knowledge of the Fathers and documents of the Church so that his pupils were thoroughly drilled in the use of Denziger and Rouet de Journel. All these qualities are manifest in his books and scholarly articles. The first of his two volumes was a textbook which grew out of class lectures, *Alpha and Omega. Theses Quaedam Selectae. De Deo Uno et Trino, Creante et Elevante, et De Novissimis* (1935), pp. x + 179. The second book was intended for a wider audience and was concerned with a more limited subject: the position of a modern Protestant theologian. As the title of the book implies, further similar works were contemplated, a plan which, unfortunately, was not to be carried out. *Catholic Faith and Modern Theologies. The Theology of Emil Brunner* (1948). Pp. 96.

In the revival of theology in American Catholic scholars Father Moran can be considered a pioneer whose interest showed itself practically by a steady flow of articles over the years, as the following list shows. Except where noted, all of these were published in *The American Ecclesiastical Review.*

(1) "Is Antichrist a Man?" XCII, 6 (June, 1935), 578-85.

(2) "Calvinism Rises from its Ashes," *Thought,* XII (1937), 447-57. This article dealt particularly with the writings of Emil Brunner.

(3) "The Eucharist in St. John VI," CII, 2 (Feb. 1940), 135-47.

(4) "A Protestant View of Marriage and Virginity," CVIII, 1 (Jan. 1943), 23-36. This article likewise discussed certain teachings of Brunner.

(5) "St. John's Doctrine on the Logos," CXIII, 5 (Nov. 1945), 358-65.

(6) "Can Lutheranism Survive in Germany?" CXIV, 6 (June, 1946), 415-23.

(7) "Justification by Faith and Works," CXIX, 6 (Dec. 1948), 407-13.

(8) "St. Paul's Christology," CXX, 6 (June, 1949), 463-68.

(9) "St. Paul and the Mystery Religions," CXXII, 6 (June, 1950), 419-29.

(10) "The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment," CXXIV, 2 (Feb., 1951), 110-18.

(11) "The Apologetics of the Man Born Blind," CXXVI, 2 (Feb. 1952), 90-96

(12) "The All-Embracing Church," CXXVIII, 1 (Jan. 1953), 33-39.

(13) "Two Pillars of Rome," CXXX, 1 (Jan. 1954), 1-8.

(14) "St. Paul's Doctrine on the Angels," CXXXII, 6 (June, 1955), 378-84.

(15) "Holy Trinity," *Action,* VIII (June, 1955), 25-27.

(16) "What Luther Did Not Read," CXXXIII, 1 (July, 1955), 30-34.

(17) "We Follow Christ," CXXXIV, 4 (April, 1956), 217-20. This was a discussion of some current non-Catholic views.

A good estimate of Father Moran's work was given by Fr. Joesph B. McAllister in his review of *The Theology of Emil Brunner* in *The American Ecclesiastical Review.* Father McAllister noted that "Father Moran has produced a valuable, refreshing work, of broad learning and keen dialectic. It can be recommended without hesitation to Catholic and non-Catholic alike, professional theologian or layman."

A short time before the end Father Moran received a copy of his final contribution to *The American Ecclesiastical Review.* What

was for him the guiding principle in life and in death is aptly expressed in that article's title: "We follow Christ."

JOHN J. COLLINS, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for September, 1906, contributed by Fr. Joseph P. Conroy, S.J., is entitled "St. Paul's Gift of Daring." The writer gives an excellent portrayal of the character of the Apostles to the Gentiles, with its many natural and supernatural gifts, and finds the spirit of daring the basic trait of his character. He says: "The most wonderful thing about such daring as was his was that his abundant success never urged him forward into rashness; while on the other hand, the distressing failures he frequently met with never pushed him a hair's breadth back toward the degeneracy of timidity." . . . Fr. H. G. Hughes, of England, concludes his series on "The Devotion to the Sacred Heart," defending this devotion against the charge of sentimentalism. (It is interesting to note that the opinion favored by Father Hughes concerning the scope of the *love* of Our Lord venerated in the devotion of the Sacred Heart—that it is both His divine and His human love—is the doctrine enunicated by Pope Pius XII in his recent Encyclical on the Sacred Heart).... Fr. H. Heuser, the editor, writes on "Literary Work and the American Clergy." He encourages the habit of reading good literature, and also recommends that the members of the clergy write letters to periodicals, expressing their views on current topics of particular interest to priests. . . . Fr. P. J. Connolly, S. J., contributes an article on Principles of Literary Criticism, Old and New." . . . Fr. W. Dennehy, of Ireland, concludes his historical account of Trinity College, Dublin. . . . Fr. R. H. Benson, of England, presents the seventh chapter of his novel, "A Mirror of Shalott," composed of tales of the preternatural. . . . Bishop Stang, of Fall River, gives "Some Suggestions Touching the Study of Moral Theology in our Seminaries." He believes that too much time is given to this branch. He suggests that all the matter pertaining to the sixth and ninth commandments and the *debitum conjugale* be given in four or five lessons toward the end of the final year of theology. . . . Mr. W. H. Grattan Flood, of Ireland, contributes an interesting account of the Irish monk, Sedulius (O'Sheil), the distinguished hymn-writer of the fifth century.

F. J. C.

MARY, QUEEN OF WISDOM

Two years ago our gloriously reigning Sovereign Pontiff proclaimed the Blessed Virgin Mary Queen of the Universe. His action was timed to coincide almost with International Congress of Mariology. Both events were planned as highlights of a very significant year, the Marian Year of 1954.

The Marian Year marked a century that has passed since the dogmatic definition of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In the assaying of the gains of that century which was made not only at the Rome Congress but at Mariological Congresses throughout the world at that time, it became strikingly clear that Mariological doctrine—the theology about Mary—had developed remarkably within that period.

Reflecting on this fact fills us with a spirit of reverential admiration and of profound wonder: the loving designs of Divine Providence had caused this definition to be made at the proper moment in history. It really *defined,* terminated, the ancient discussions on Mary's sinlessness and marked at the same time a clear starting point for ever more profound considerations of Mary's intimate role in God's plan for man's salvation. If the early centuries of the Church may be designated Christological inasmuch as they saw the clarification of what divine revelation tells us of our Saviour, this century may well be termed Mariological in a not dissimilar sense. Mary's unique position as Co-Redemptrix, as Mediatrix, as Spiritual Mother of Men, her Queenship—all have been brought in these years into much clearer focus.

It is this last point I should like to consider here. We may well dwell on it appropriately since it is the title of Our Lady's latest feast—the Feast of *Maria Regina,* the Feast in which the whole Church, in all parts of the world, unites in proffering solemn allegiance to the Queen of the Universe. I should like further to make a special precision regarding Mary's Queenship, a percision which would amount to this, namely, that Mary is *rightly and properly called Queen of Wisdom.*

Wisdom has many senses. Aristotle in the beginning of his *Metaphysics* gives a classic encomium of the wise man; and St. Thomas following Aristotle often spoke of the science of metaphysics as Wisdom

We recall that there is a gift of the Holy Ghost, indeed one that the Bishop invoked for us at our Confirmation, which is called Wisdom. This highest of the Holy Spirit's seven gifts is the especial source of that wonderous gift of God which is contemplation such as the Saints spoke of.

God Himself is Infinite Wisdom. And in a special way, His Divine Word, the Second Person of the Most Blessed Trinity, is spoken of as Wisdom. Thus in Advent we have the famous "O" Antiphon, *O Sapientia.*

There is another Wisdom yet. It is not a wisdom entirely acquired, such as metaphysics; nor is it ordinarily infused as is the Gift of Wisdom. I mean Sacred Theology. St. Thomas in the sixth article of the *Summa* points out that Theology is truly a wisdom because it treats of the highest principle of the whole universe, namely God; and it is above all human because it treats of God not only as First Cause, but also of Him as He is known to Himself and revealed to us; it treats of our human acts ordained to that final end which is perfect knowledge of God in which formally consists eternal bliss.

We could examine Our Lady's Queenship in respect to "Wisdom" in all its various senses. Let us limit ourselves to the last meaning of Wisdom, that is to Wisdom as it signifies Sacred Theology. We are asking then is Mary rightly and properly called Queen of Theology.

All of us are accustomed to think of Mary as a Queen. From our youth we have meditated on the fifth Glorious Mystery of the Most Holy Rosary. We have frequently said the beautiful invocations to Mary "Queen" in the Litany of Loretto. The Blessed Virgin herself, if we are to believe the usual accounts, used the title at Fatima when she identified herself to the children there as the "Lady," that is, the Queen, "of the Rosary." And since the Marian Year's new feast, we think more often of Mary as Queen of the Universe.

I remember reading once a newspaper heading in which three senses of the title "Queen" were implied: three queens, it was said, were present together on a special occasion. One was the reigning queen, the sovereign; another was her mother, the third, her grandmother. The two latter queens, even when their respective consorts were alive and reigning, were also designated queens though they exercised no jurisdiction. Several of our cities are called the "Queen City" because of a certain pre-eminence or excellence they are said to enjoy.

To Our Lady is undoubtedly attributed queenship in the primary sense. She exercises a certain sovereignty, not indeed of justice, for Christ the King has reserved that "half of His Kingdom" to Himself. Still she may truly be said to rule insofar as she disposes, orders, regulates, and dispenses favors in the kingdom of Christ: she is the Dispensatrix of God's graces: "Hail, holy Queen, Mother of Mercy," we proclaim her. In the new office of Mary Queen we salute her as Queen of Mercy *Salve, Regina Misericordiae.*[1] She is Queen too because she is associated with the King Christ, the Second Adam, as the New Eve: in the divine plan she is the spiritual Mother of all who are born in Christ's saving grace.

She is without doubt Queen too in this Kingdom in the perfect and sublime possession of grace: her pre-eminence, even from the beginning of her existence, is manifest to us all from the clear teaching of the Church. Pius IX in defining in *Ineffabilis Deus* the Immaculate Conception said that Mary "has shone with such fullness of grace and such innocence, that she has been an ineffable miracle of the Almighty, yes even the crown of all miracles"; and our presently gloriously reigning Pontiff, on the occasion of the coronation of the statue at Fatima in 1946, said that Mary possesses more grace than all the angels and saints, taken singly or collectively. She is truly as St. Bonaventure declares *Regina excellentissima;* and as the *Communio* of the new feast says: *Regina mundi dignissima.*[2]

Queenship then is said of Mary in different senses. May we—in one or several of these senses—say that Mary is properly called the Queen of that Wisdom which is Sacred Theology?

Theology is a science, the science treating about the God of revelation. Is it possible to use terminology which implies sovereignty, or ruling, in regard to such an entity? We do as a matter of fact say that one science has a commanding position over another, and that correlatively one science is "subordinate" to another. How often is not philosophy said to be a handmaid, its position regarding Theology, ancillary. And the ancients, we know, worked out the doctrine of the subordination of sciences, and found for example that metaphysics, or philosophical wisdom, occupied an architectonic position regarding all the others, particularly because of its possession of the supreme principles of all purely human sciences.

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XLVII (1955), 470. [2] Cf. *ibid.*

Theology, it is true, as we know from our study of article three of the *Summa,* is one science, a *species atoma.* But in this one science which is concerned with God *sub ratione Deitatis,* with the God of revelation, can we not distinguish truths which are in some sense architectonic in regard to others, which, being understood, help mightily to explain others, which may thus be said to have a certain "dominance" over others? Surely the doctrine of Christ who became man so that we might understand the invisible things of God, as we are reminded in the Christmas Preface, is such a truth. Is not the doctrine of Mary in an analogous position?

We know indeed that Mary is but a creature; that she is utterly dependent on Christ her Redeemer. But we know also, that in the most free plan of God, Mary was predestined with Christ in that same decree as Christ, as is clear from the *Ineffabilis Deus;* that she was His associate in the redemptive act on Calvary, and with Him dispenses saving graces now to mankind. Is not then Mariological doctrine in a dominant position in Theology? Is not Mary, after Christ, the one in whom we are to learn about God? If we penetrate Mariology deeply we shall know God better. Mary, that is, the truth God has revealed about Mary and the conclusions theologians evolve from this revelation, this Mary, is the Queen of Theology.

Theology's task, as St. Augustine and St. Thomas tell us in the second article of the *Summa,* is to nourish, defend, strengthen, the faith. The truth about Mary, Mariological doctrine, does this in an eminent degree. It is historically proved that when Mary's place is understood heresy is avoided, as in the time of Nestorius. Theology must explain and illumine the faith by making use of the effects of God: Mary is God's masterpiece. She is the marvelous work of His omnipotence; she proclaims His bounteous act of creation; she whose sanctity the Church describes as most exalted tells us something of the Holiness which is God; she is "the brightness of eternal Light and the unspotted mirror of God's Majesty, and the image of His goodness."[3]

Theology is not only speculative but also practical. Unlike philosophical wisdom, Theology is concerned also with doing, as we are taught in the fourth article in the *Summa.* Theology's primary task is indeed the contemplation of divine truth; but it also teaches

[3] *Wisdom,* 7 : 25.

us the meaning of these truths in our lives. Mariological truth is a dominant truth not only in theological speculation, but is also in the practical aspects of the science. Spiritual Theology cannot neglect the part Mary plays in our spiritual life. Among its most important doctrines are those which point out the way to Christ, to God, through Mary; and in indicating the importance of devotional practices in the development of the spiritual life, it cannot fail to accentuate that to the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the use of the Holy Rosary.

The study of Mariology then should be embraced enthusiastically (always of course according to the norms taught by the Holy Father on Oct. 24, 1954). Thus in the order of theological truths will be exercised Mary's unique role of bringing an understanding of God to us, of bringing us to know better our God.

Theology can also be considered not only objectively, that is as a science—as we have thus far been considering it—but also subjectively, as it is in us. Theology in us pertains to the perfection of our being. In the philosopher's terminology, it is an accident, a quality: for it is that kind of predicamental quality which is called a habit, an intellectual habit, such as prudence and art. It is a naturally acquired habit—"per studium habetur" St. Thomas remarks. We have to work hard to intensify and deepen this perfection in our minds; but it differs from other acquired habits in that its foundation, its principles, are the articles of faith. The infused virtue of faith gives us our theological principles. An unbeliever cannot be a theologian.

Our Lady exercises a queenly position in regard to this habit of Theology in us inasmuch as it is through her mediation that we have the faith. All graces come to us through Mary—our faith is one of God's greatest graces. With Christ Mary merited in her way this grace for us at Calvary; she was its dispensatrix at its infusion. And it is through Mary's suppliant omnipotence that we may especially hope for an increase, a deepening of it. Surely she who exercises sovereignity regarding the principles of the science of Theology, as it is in us, may rightly be said to be queen of that science itself.

Mary's queenship of Theology will not cease with this life, just as Theology itself perdures. It will derive its principles, however, no longer from faith— which shall give way to that blessed vision of God. But the vision of God is possible to our intellects through

the light of glory, another grace perfecting our intellects and fitting then for the beatific vision; this grace too we shall owe to the mediation of our Queen.

As theologians we can well ask Mary to deepen our faith. "Blessed art thou who hast believed" was said of her by St. Elizabeth and it is repeated in the Magnificat Antiphon of the new Feast of Mary, Queen. St. Augustine tells us that Mary first conceived Christ in her heart, that is, by faith. A humble and trustful petition for a constant increase of the fullness of faith that perfected the heart of Mary will surely have its reward.

If Mary be Queen of that Wisdom which is Theology, if she be Queen of Theology, we can scarcely deny her the title of Queen of Theologians. For in God's worthy Mother during her earthly life, there was a fullness of knowledge of divine Revelation and the truths of salvation; and in heaven, so St. Albert the Great and others tell us, her knowledge of the things of God is surpassed by that of no other creature.

Theologians especially then should pray to Mary, Queen of Wisdom, Queen of Theology, that she who is full of grace, who is the seat of Wisdom, may aid them mightily in the study of Theology, of sacred doctrine. Through her intercession the theologian can, not entirely unlike St. Albert the Great, make special progress in this sacred science. Further, Mary who alone "destroyed all heresies," Mary who is "terrible as an army set in array" will give the theologian the strength to defend divine truth. Mary, Queen of Wisdom, will help him to do battle with and overcome all foolishness, except that which is really the Wisdom of the Cross.

The faithful theologian, the devoted exponent of God's truth, who explains to others the truth that is Mary, may confidently hope to find a safe haven at last under the mantle of this Queen, who says: "I am the mother of fair love, and of fear, and of knowledge, and of holy hope . . . In me is all grace of the way and of truth . . . He that hearkeneth to me, shall not be confounded; and they that work by me, shall not sin. They that explain me shall have life everlasting."[4]

T. M. Sparks, O.P.

Dominican House of Studies
River Forest, Ill.

[4] *Ecclesiasticus*, 24: 24 ff.

THE POPE'S TEACHING ON ORGANIC TRANSPLANTATION

On May 14, 1956, Pope Pius XII delivered an important address to a group composed of representatives of the Italian Association of Donors of the Cornea and of doctors, mostly eye specialists. The main subject of his discourse was the morality of transplanting the cornea of a corpse to a living person, who may thus be enabled to recover his sight. However, in connection with this theme the Sovereign Pontiff took occasion to treat of several other related topics which have been the subject of theological discussion in recent years. With the assurance that the readers of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* will find this statement of the Holy Father most interesting, the editors have decided to present it, translated from the original French, in its entirety, with a brief commentary added to emphasize its most significant features.

THE POPE'S ADDRESS

Gentlemen:

You have requested from Us a word of orientation, approval and encouragement for your Association, which strives to aid the blind and those whose eyesight is affected, through the technical and scientific resources of modern surgery. Most willingly We shall treat in this brief allocution of the goal which you propose for yourselves.

The abundant documentation which you have provided for Us far exceeds the precise theme which We intend to develop. It concerns the entire problem, daily becoming more acute, of the transplantation of tissues from one person to another, according to its various aspects—biological and medical, technical and surgical, juridical, moral and religious. We are limiting ourselves to the religious and moral aspects of the transplantation of the cornea, not between living human beings (of that We shall not speak today), but from the dead body to the living person. However, We shall be obliged to go beyond the strict limits of this topic to speak of certain opinions which We have encountered on this occasion.

We have examined the various statements which you have given Us. By their objectivity, their moderation, their scientific exactness, the explanations which they give on the conditions necessary for a

transplantation of the cornea, on its diagnosis and its prognosis, have made a profound impression on Us.

Before coming to our topic, properly so-called, may it be permitted Us to make two more general remarks. The "terminology" which We have found in the reports and in the printed texts makes a distinction between autograft (the transfer of the tissues from one part to another part of the same individual's body), homograft (the transfer of the tissues from one individual to another of the same species—that is, from one man to another) and heterograft (the transfer of tissues between two individuals of different species—that is, in the present instance, between an animal and a human being). This last case calls for some definite statements from the religious and moral standpoint. It cannot be said that every transplantation of tissues (biologically possible) between individuals of different species is morally wrong; but still less is it true that any heterogeneous transplantation that is biologically possible is not forbidden or is not objectionable. We must distinguish one case from the other and consider what type of tissue or what organ is to be transplanted. The transplantation of the sexual glands of an animal to man is to be rejected as immoral. On the contrary, the transplantation of a cornea from a non-human being to a human being would not raise any moral difficulty if it were biologically possible and were indicated. If one declared absolutely that transplantation is morally forbidden, on the basis of diversity of species, he would logically have to hold that cellular therapy, which is being practiced more and more frequently, is wrong; often living cells are taken from a non-human being to be transplanted to a human being, where they exercise their function.

We have also found in the terminological explanations of the most recently printed work a remark which concerns the very theme of Our present discourse. It is there stated that the Italian word *innesto*, used to designate the transfer of parts of a dead body to a living person, is inexact and not properly employed. The text [Italian] reads: "It is not correct to designate as *innesto* (grafting) the transfer of tissues that are fixed (dead and preserved), since it would be more exact to speak of an *impianto* (implanting) or of an *inclusione* (including) of a dead tissue in a living tissue." You can evaluate this assertion from the medical standpoint; from the philosophical and theological standpoint the criticism is justified. The transfer of a tissue or of an organ from a corpse to a living person is not a transfer from man to man; the corpse *was* a man but *is* one no longer.

We have also noticed in the printed documentation another remark which leads to confusion and which We believe We must rectify. To prove that the excision of organs necessary for transplantation from

one living person to another is conformable to nature and lawful, it is put in the same category as that of a particular physical organ done in the interest of an entire physical body. Thus, the members of the individual would be considered as parts and members of the whole organism which constitutes "humanity," in the same manner—or almost in the same manner—as they are parts of the individual organism of a man. Then it is argued that, if it is permitted in a case of necessity to sacrifice a particular member (hand, foot, eye, ear, kidney, sexual gland) to the organism of "the man" it would likewise be permitted to sacrifice such a particular member to the organism of "humanity" (in the person of one of its members who is sick and suffering). The purpose visualized by this manner of argumentation, to heal, or at least to soothe the ailments of others, is understandable and praiseworthy, but the method proposed and the argument on which it is based are erroneous. The essential difference between a physical organism and a moral organism is neglected, as is also the essential qualitative difference between the relation of the parts to the whole in these two types of organisms. The physical organism of "the man" is one complete whole in its being; the members are parts united and bound together in their very physical essence; they are so absorbed by the whole that they possess no independence; they exist only for the sake of the total organism and have no other end than that of the total organism. It is an entirely different matter in the case of the moral organism that is humanity. This constitutes one whole body only as regards its action and its finality; individuals in as far as they are members of this organism are only functional parts; the "whole" cannot make demands on them except in what pertains to the sphere of action. In their physical being individuals are not in any way dependent on one another or on humanity; direct evidence and common sense prove the contrary assertion to be false. On this account the total organism which is humanity has no right to impose on individuals' demands in the domain of physical being on the grounds of any natural right of the "whole" to dispose of the parts. The excision of a particular organ would be an example of direct interference, not only in the sphere of the individual's action, but also and chiefly in that of his being, on the part of a "whole" which is purely functional—"humanity," "society," "the State"—in which the individual is incorporated only as a functional member and as regards action. In an entirely different context We have previously emphasized the significance and the importance of this consideration and recalled the necessary distinction, which must carefully be taken into account, between the physical organisms and the moral organism. This was in our Encyclical of June 29, 1943, on the "Mystical Body

of Christ." What We have just said We then summarized in several phrases which those who are not theologians would perhaps not grasp immediately because of their concise form, but in which they would discover, after a careful perusal, a better understanding of the difference which the relations of whole to part bear in a physical organism and in one that is moral. It was then necessary to explain how the simple Catholic is part of the Mysical Body of Christ, which is the Church, and the difference between this relation and that which exists in a physical organism. We then said:

[Here the Sovereign Pontiff spoke in Latin, quoting from the original text of *Mystici Corporis*. The following is the translation, as issued by the NCWC (n. 60).]

"In a natural body the principle of unity so unites the parts that each lacks its own individual subsistence; on the contrary, in the Mystical Body that mutual union, though intrinsic, links the members by a bond which leaves to each intact his own personality. Besides, if we examine the relation existing between the several members and between the members and the head, in every physical, living body all the different members are ultimately destined to the good of the whole alone; while every moral association of men, if we look to its ultimate usefulness, is in the end directed to the advancement of all and of every single member" (*AAS*, XXV, 221 f.).

We now return to our main theme, the moral evaluation of the transplantation of the cornea from a dead body to a living person in order to assist those who are blind or are becoming blind. At the service of such persons today are placed the charity and the sympathy of many compassionate individuals, as well as the progress of technique and of scientific surgery, with all their inventive resources, their daring and their perseverance. The psychology of the blind person enables us to understand his need of compassionate assistance and to realize how thankfully he receives it.

The Gospel of St. Luke contains a vivid description of the psychology of the blind person, which is a masterpiece. The blind man of Jericho, hearing the crowd pass by, asked what it meant. He was told that Jesus of Nazareth was passing that way. Then he cried out: "Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me." The people commanded him to be silent, but he continued to cry out all the more: "Son of David, have mercy on me." Then Jesus commanded that he be brought to Him. "What wilt thou that I do for thee?". . . "Lord, that I may see." . . . "Receive thy sight; thy faith has saved thee." "And at once he received his sight, and followed Jesus, glorifying God" (*Luke*, 18:35-43). That cry, "Lord, that I may see," resounds

in the ears and hearts of all; and so, you wish to answer it and give assistance, as far as lies in your power. You assure Us that the transfer of the cornea constitutes for many sick persons a means that promises a cure or at least relief and improvement. Well, use it and help such persons in as far as this is possible and lawful—naturally, choosing the cases with great discretion and prudence.

The documents which you have provided for Us enable one to visualize the operation which you perform. The removal of the cornea can be effected in two ways, you say, either by "lamellary keratoplasties" or by "perforating keratoplasties." If the requisite technique is observed, the eye can be preserved for a period of from 48 to 60 hours after removal. If several clinics are not too far apart from one another, they can set up a reserve of material ready for use and mutually render one another assistance according to the needs of particular cases. We also find in your documentation general information on the indications for the transplanting of the cornea and on its possibilities of success. The majority of those who are blind or are becoming blind cannot be helped by this operation. You caution against vain hopes in the prognosis of operable cases. You write: "It is good that the public shall be aware that the transplanting of other tissues from the eye and especially of the entire eye is not possible in man; it is possible to substitute, and that only partially, only the front portion of the dioptrical apparatus of the eye." As to the success of the procedure, you inform Us that of the 4360 cases published between 1948 and 1954, 45% to 65% have had a positive result, and a like percentage is found in cases not published. You add: "There was an improvement over the previous condition." In only 20% of the cases was "vision more or less similar to normal vision" obtained. You note in conclusion that in many countries the laws and ordinances of the State do not permit a very wide utilization of corneal transplantation, and that consequently it is impossible to aid a great number of blind persons or of those who are losing their sight. All this concerns the medical and technical aspect of your activities.

From the moral and religious aspect, there is no objection to the removal of the cornea from a corpse, whether by lamellary or by perforating keratoplasties, if these are considered in themselves. To the patient who receives the benefit of these operations they represent a restoration and a correction of a defect, suffered from birth or brought on by accident. As to the deceased from whom the cornea is taken, nothing is done to affect *goods* to which he has a right or to his *right* to these goods. A corpse no longer is a subject of a right in the strict sense of the word, for it is deprived of the personality which alone can be a subject of a right. The excision is not the

removal of a *good;* the organs of sight in reality (their presence and integrity) have no longer the character of *goods* in a corpse because they serve it no longer and have no longer a relation to any end. This does not at all signify that in regard to the dead body of a human being there cannot be, or that in fact there are not, moral obligations, rules or prohibitions. This does not signify either that those third parties who are charged with the care of the corpse, of its integrity and of the treatment to which it will be subjected cannot surrender, or in fact do not surrender rights and duties properly so-called. The very contrary is true. Keratoplastic operations which are not in themselves morally objectionable can for some reason be not above reproach and even directly immoral.

In the first place, it is necessary to condemn a morally erroneous judgment which is formed in the soul of a person but usually influences his external conduct, and consists in putting the corpse of a human being on the same plane as that of an animal or even of a simple "thing." The dead body of an animal can be used in almost all its parts; the same can be said in regard to the dead body of a human being considered from a purely material aspect—that is to say, from the standpoint of the elements of which it is composed. For some, this attitude constitutes the final criterion of thought and the final principle of action. Such an attitude implies an error in judgment and a rejection of psychology and of the religious and moral sense. For the dead body of a human being deserves to be regarded entirely differently. The body was the abode of a spiritual and immortal soul, an essentially constitutive part of a human person whose dignity it shared. Something of this dignity still remains in the corpse. We can say also that, since it is a component of man, it has been formed "to the image and likeness" of God, which extends far beyond the general vestiges of divine resemblance that are found both in the animals deprived of intelligence and even in purely material inanimate creatures. Even to the dead body we can apply to a certain extent the words of the Apostle: "Do you not know that your members are the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you?" (*I Cor.*, 6:19). Finally, the dead body is destined to the resurrection and eternal life. This is not true of the body of an animal, and it proves that it is not sufficient to visualize "therapeutic purposes" for a proper evaluation and treatment of the human corpse. On the other hand, it is equally true that medical science and the formation of future doctors demand a detailed knowledge of the human body, and that it is necessary to have corpses as objects of study. The statements presented previously are not opposed to this. A person can seek this legitimate objective while fully accepting what We have just said. It follows from this that a person may will to

dispose of his body and to destine it to ends that are useful, morally irreproachable and even noble, among them the desire to aid the sick and the suffering. One may make a decision of this nature with respect to his own body with full realization of the reverence that is due to it, and with recognition of the words spoken by the Apostle to the Corinthians. We should not condemn such a decision, but rather positively justify it. Consider, for example, the noble deed of Don Carlo Gnocchi. Unless circumstances impose an obligation we must respect the liberty and spontaneity of the parties involved. Ordinarily the deed cannot be presented as a duty or as an obligatory act of charity. In proposing it, an intelligent reserve must be maintained, in order to avoid serious internal and external conflicts. Moreover, must one, as the problem often arises, refuse in principle all recompense? This question remains unanswered. It cannot be doubted that grave abuses can occur if a recompense is demanded; but it would be going too far to declare as immoral every acceptance or every demand of payment. The case is similar to that of a blood transfusion; it is commendable for the donor to refuse a recompense; but it is not necessarily a fault to accept it.

The removal of the cornea, though perfectly lawful in itself, can also become illicit if the rights and the feelings of the third parties charged with the care of the body are violated, especially the near relatives. Other persons also might be injured because of public or private rights. It would not be humane to ignore sentiments so profound in the interest of medicine or of "therapeutic aims." Generally speaking, it should not be permitted to doctors to undertake excisions or other operations on a corpse without the permission of those charged with the care of the dead body, and perhaps even despite objections previously expressed by the deceased person himself. It would not be fair either if the bodies of poor patients in public clinics and hospitals were destined regularly to the service of doctors and surgeons, while the bodies of wealthier patients are not treated thus. Money and social status should not intervene when one is concerned with human feelings of so delicate a nature. On the other hand, it is well to educate the public and to explain to people intelligently and respectfully that to consent explicitly or tacitly to serious mutilations of a corpse in the interest of those who are suffering is no violation of the reverence due to the deceased since it is justified by valid reasons. Nevertheless, this consent can involve sadness and sacrifice for the near relatives, but this sacrifice is glorified by the aureole of merciful charity toward some suffering brothers.

Public authorities and laws which concern the use of corpses should, in general, have regard for these same moral and human considerations,

since they are based on human nature itself, which takes precedence over society in the order of causality and in dignity. In particular, public authorities have the duty to supervise their enforcement and above all to take care that a "corpse" shall not be considered and treated as such until death has been sufficiently proved. On the other hand, public authorities are empowered to protect the lawful interests of medicine and of medical education. If it is suspected that death was due to a criminal cause or if there is danger to the public health, the corpse must be delivered to the authorities. All this can and should be done without neglect of the respect due to the deceased and to the rights of the near relatives. Finally, public authorities can contribute effectively toward convincing people of the necessity and of the moral lawfulness of certain regulations regarding dead bodies and thus preventing or dispelling the occasion of conflicts, both internal and external, in the individual, the family and society.

Almost two years ago, on September 30, 1954, We expressed these same ideas in an allocution to the Eighth Congress of the International Medical Association, and We would now wish to repeat and to confirm what We then said in a brief paragraph: "In what concerns the removal of the parts of the body of a dead person for therapeutic purposes, it is not permitted to a doctor to treat the corpse in any way he wishes. It belongs to public authority to lay down suitable regulations. But even public authority may not act arbitrarily. There are legal regulations to which one can raise serious objections. One norm, such as that which permits the doctor in a sanatorium to remove parts of the body for therapeutic purposes, even though every spirit of gain is excluded, cannot be honored because of the existent possibility that it might be interpreted too freely. Then, too, the rights and duties of those whose obligation it is to assume responsibility for the body of the deceased must also be taken into consideration. And finally, the demands of natural morality, which forbid us to consider and treat the body of a human being merely as a thing, or as the body of an animal, must at all times be duly respected." (*Discorsi e Radiomessaggi,* XVI, 176.)

With the hope of having given you a more precise orientation and of having facilitated a more profound understanding of the religious and moral aspects of this subject, We grant you wholeheartedly our Apostolic Blessing.

COMMENTARY

The following points, pertinent to medical ethics, brought out in the instructive and inspiring discourse of the Sovereign Pontiff presented above, are especially worthy of emphasis:

1. The principal theme of the Pope is that *per se* it is morally lawful to transfer the cornea from a dead human body to a living person when there is good reason to hope that this operation will procure assistance or relief to one who is blind or partially blind. In recent years there has been considerable success with this type of operation, both in Europe and in the United States—keratoplastic surgery, as it is called. Eyebanks have been established, containing corneas willed by generous persons for use after their death. Most persons would regard it as fully evident that such a donation is perfectly licit, and would be surprised that any doubt could be entertained on this subject. However, there have been some who declared that the mutilation of a corpse for the benefit of a living person is sinful. Thus, in August, 1954, an anonymous writer made such a statement in the *Osservatore della Domenica,* a weekly periodical published in Rome (not to be confused with the *Osservatore Romano*). In commenting on this view, I wrote in *Catholic Men* for October, 1954: "There is no moral difficulty in this procedure (the transfer of the cornea from a corpse to a living person) as long as proper permission has been obtained, since a dead body has no rights. Before his death a person may give permission for this use of his corpse; or it may be granted after his death by the relatives. It is a deed of Christian charity to make such donations, as is done for the maintenance of eye banks." The Holy Father has now officially stated that this manner of transplantation is *per se* morally good and commendable. He praises explicitly Don Carlo Gnocchi, an Italian priest recently deceased, who willed his cornea to some blind children.

From this we can logically conclude that other portions of a dead body may be used to aid the living, when this is surgically possible. Thus, the bones of a child who has died before birth can sometimes be transferred to a living person.

2. The Pope emphasizes, however, that neither doctors nor civil officials possess unrestricted rights over a dead body. The rights of the deceased person's relatives must be respected. Furthermore, the wish expressed by the deceased before his death may not be entirely rejected. Moreover, it is a Christian principle that even the dead body retains a sacredness, as the former abode of an immortal soul, which entitles it to a measure of respect. The fact that a person died penniless does not give the state unrestricted rights to the use of his body for

experimental or therapeutical purposes. However, the Holy Father indicates that at times the common good justifies the use of dead bodies even against the will of the deceased or of his relatives. Thus, he says that when there is danger to public health, a body is to be delivered to the authorities. Again, he states that *ordinarily* there is no obligation to allow the use of a dead body for the benefit of the living, thus implying that *sometimes* such an obligation may exist, which even might be enforced by the civil law. In this matter, as in many ethical fields where there can be a conflict between the common good and the rights of the individual, there can be diversities of view when we come to the application of principles to concrete cases. But the principles must be definitely maintained.

As a practical point, the Pope states that while the gratuitous donation of the requisite portion of the dead body is commendable, no moral wrong is committed if the donor seeks some recompense, as in the case when a blood transfusion is given.

3. The Pope declares that, generally speaking, portions of the body of an animal may be transferred to a human being. The basic reason is that other living creatures of earth have been created for the benefit of the human race, and expressly placed under the dominion of man by the Creator.[1] But the Pope makes a definite exception regarding the sexual glands. A human being may not lawfully have transferred to his body those organs of a lower animal that serve for reproduction. The reason is that the generative organs are intended primarily for the maintenance of the species rather than for the benefit of the individual, and the transfer of the sexual glands of a lower species to a human being would not contribute toward the maintenance of the human race. According to Iorio, attempts of this nature were made by Voronoff who transferred the testicles and the ovaries of monkeys to boys and girls.[2] As is very evident, such procedures are based on an absolutely materialistic assimilation of man with the brute.

It is worthy of note that the Pope speaks of the transfer of sex *glands*—that is, those organs directly productive of offspring, the ovaries and testicles. It would seem that there would be no sin involved in the use of animal tissues to repair those human organs

[1] *Gen.*, 1:28.

[2] *Theologia moralis* (Naples, 1946), II, n. 168.

that contribute only indirectly to generation, such as the vagina or the uterus, if such a transplantation were regarded as possible and beneficial.

4. The Holy Father expressly states at the beginning of his address that he does not intend to discuss the problem of the transplantation of an organ from a living human being to another living person. This is a problem that has been extensively discussed by Catholic theologians in recent years without coming to any definite conclusions. Examples of this type of surgical procedure are taking place with increasing frequency. A very striking case occurred recently in Boston, where a young man donated a kidney to his twin brother—apparently with most satisfactory results. While the Sovereign Pontiff declares that he does not intend to decide on the morality of such an operation, he rejects as a defense of this procedure the idea that the individual human being is a member of society in the same sense as a particular bodily organ is a member of the whole body, so that an individual human being (or a portion of his body) can be sacrificed for the welfare of society, just as a particular bodily organ can be sacrificed for the benefit of the whole body. This erroneous notion has frequently been condemned by Pope Pius XII. However, from this it does not follow that the Pope condemns transplantation between living human beings itself, as long as it is based on a valid argument. Apparently he has refrained from discussing this question because he wishes to see if theologians will produce an argument that will justify this type of operation. Beyond doubt, there is a general feeling that it is a noble deed to give a fellow man a portion of our body, and the Pope does not wish to declare such a practice sinful until it is evident that no good argument in its support can be produced.

A case on which the Pope did not touch, but which, I believe, can easily be solved, occurs when a person needs the excision of an organ that is detrimental to himself, but may be beneficial to another. Thus, if a man has lost the sight of an eye through atrophy of the nerve he may surely have it removed. In the event that the cornea would be helpful to another I see no objection to his donating this portion to his needy fellow man.

5. From the words of the Holy Father it is very clear that a person performs a good deed when he leaves his body to a hospital or a medical school for the purpose of anatomical study. Indeed, it

is not forbidden to accept a remuneration during one's lifetime for one's body, to be delivered to the institution after death. It should be remembered, however, that provision should be made for the burial of the remains after they have ceased to be useful for the purpose of medical research.

Pope Pius XII in this address shows that he is fully abreast of the times in his appreciation of the moral problems confronting medicine and surgery. He clearly teaches us that a reasonable use of the dead body for the benefit of the living is not opposed to the reverence that is due to it as a former abode of the Holy Spirit, destined to the glory of the resurrection.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

LEA, COULTON, AND ANTI-CATHOLICISM

PART I

That Protestants should give unquestioning assent to so many bitterly anti-Catholic propositions continues to cause amazement to born Catholics. Even such Protestants as finally undergo conversion frequently confess that Rome was the last place where they expected to find religious truth and moral goodness. The U.S.S.R. itself often meets with more Protestant tolerance. As Will Herberg, the well known Jewish writer, has recently declared, "The pervasive fear of Rome has vitiated the Protestant witness against Communism." Protestant leaders, he says, feel they must be "careful" how they oppose Communism lest they "play into the hands of Rome."[1] At least a partial explanation of this Protestant suspicion of all things Catholic we have from another Jewish writer, the eminent Oxford University historian, Cecil Roth, who has warned his coreligionists, "English history is definitely anti-Catholic."[2]

For a long time two historians have been the outstanding sources of that anti-Catholicism: the English George Gordon Coulton (1858-1947) and the American Henry Charles Lea (1825-1909). Lea was, of course, the writer of weighty and densely documented volumes dealing with such subjects as the Inquisition, Sacerdotal Celibacy, the History of Auricular Confession, Superstition, and Witchcraft. In point of time he somewhat antedates Coulton, but in our study their trails eventually cross. Hence it seems helpful first to consider the Englishman.

G. G. COULTON

To Coulton anti-Catholicism was meat and drink. Among serious English historians he was probably the last of his intolerant kind. Even his Cambridge University faculty confreres commonly remarked of him, "The man is quite mad." But his works stand in serried ranks and are being drawn upon by the not too discerning or the too well disposed as authority for an horrendous picture

[1] *Commentary*, April 1955, p. 387.
[2] *N. C. W. C. News Bulletin*, Dec. 23, 1943.

of the influence of Rome. Coulton's special field was, of course, medieval monastic life, especially of England. But his conclusions are most damaging to the entire Church and to her influence upon the whole of society.

How can the merits of the Coulton version be best assayed and his possible unfairness determined? One might meet his every charge individually, give it detailed study in text and context, and perhaps attempt a refutation. But this would take an eternity; proverbially, "A stern chase is a long one." One would then always be scurrying about on the defence; and truth can seldom overtake falsehood, especially when the falsehood takes myriad forms. Would it not be worth while rather to make some inquiry regarding Coulton himself, to see what is his probable credibility as a witness against the Church? Why not thus first appraise the *man?* After that we may ask what was the judgment passed upon his anti-Catholic indictment by his fair-minded fellow historians? For information of the man himself we have two especially revealing sources, his autobiography,[3] and his biography written by his daughter, Sarah Campion.[4]

Coulton's field of endeavor was at one time not history but the Anglican ministry. Only when he was found too heterodox for even the doctrinally tolerant Church of England did he give up his curacy. Coulton as curate had been quite gleeful at what seemed to him the damage done Rome by an attack of Renan; but he came later to realize that that attack notably involved his own position also.[5] Leaving the ministry he resumed an interrupted career of school teaching. Of his avocation even twenty years later his daughter Sarah said,

> Curiously late in developing, he had not yet found his metier: he was teaching French and German at an Army crammer's establishment run by a college friend . . . and in his spare time browsing, as he had done for years, on medieval literature of all kinds.[6]

Coulton's firm determination to give his life to history occurred only shortly before his fiftieth year. The anti-Catholic emphasis he

[3] *Fourscore Years* (New York: Macmillan, 1944).
[4] *Father: A Portrait of G. G. Coulton at Home* (London: Michael Joseph, 1948).
[5] *Fourscore Years,* p. 147.
[6] *Father,* p. 19.

gave his work seemed a continuation of his sympathy for the assaults of Renan, heightened by the perhaps subconsciously felt need to justify himself for the heterodoxy that turned him from the ministry. Coulton never, however, discontinued all practice of his creed. Sarah Campion says:

> To him attendance at Church was an act of sociability, a cooperative effort, and a necessary compromise, if contact with one's Christian fellows is to be maintained; he bowed his head, as did everyone else, but he reserved the right to think his own thoughts while he did so.[7]

Sarah's reaction to such religious practice was:

> "The business was hypocrisy, pure and simple, and (thought I) if hypocrisy is an essential part of organized religion, let us reject the whole."[8]

It seems ironic that while Coulton acted the self-righteous and scathing critic of monastic life, his own religious practice drove his daughter to become, as she declares, "an unbeliever and an infidel where all organized religions are concerned."[9]

That Coulton's personal character indicated in him further unfitness for an unbiased research and presentation of monastic history, the testimony of his two daughters seems to make obvious. Despite the loyalty of these girls to their father, they felt forced to say of their own unnatural place in his life:

> Of course, we were never as important to him as his work. . . . We both knew that his work, his battle for what he believed all his life to be the truth, had always come first.[10]

Sarah further says of her father,

> Though he came to fatherhood very late, . . . he came to it most fully equipped with all the attributes of Victorian parenthood, including that force of character, that persistence in knowing oneself to be absolutely right, which has wrecked many a home, and might have wrecked ours had Mother been less of a character.[11]

Coulton's convictions regarding the discipline of his two young daughters seem especially revealing. If he was to spend his years

[7] *Ibid.*
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 237.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

flaying the Catholic Church, it was only after he had as persistently and as soundly thrashed these children:

He not only whipped us when we deserved it, but came thereby to feel that, if we hadn't had a whipping for a while, we were just about due for one, and shouldn't miss it. One of his sterner rules was that, when we had been put to bed, there should be no talking: bed was for sleep, not for gossip. One night, when I cannot have been more than eight, Bridget [the younger child] was murmuring to me, who was practically asleep, and Father heard, and came in and whipped me before I had even a chance to wake up. . . . That sort of thing does not create a feeling that justice is being done. . . . Father's disciplinary whippings would make a book of their own.[12]

Thirty years later when the daughters were editing their father's autobiography, they there found him saying,

On the subject of corporal punishment, I have ever remained unrepentant: and my two girls, if asked their opinion on it today, would probably agree that the whippings I was forced to administer to them in their childhood were not only necessary but healthy.

Upon reading this:

"Bridget with an ominous calm took a red pencil and carefully scored the passage, writing in the margin: 'This is a lie: delete it'."[13]

Further indication of that self-opinionatedness that made Coulton such a sharp critic of the Catholic Church we find in his daughter Sarah's description of his dominance of the family even on holiday. Prepared for Alpine climbing, the family must don its hobnailed boots already in Cambridge. The result is that they "slither across half the Continent in them, before even getting a whiff of the Alps they were to grip." She tells us of the family's secret delight in a ludicrous but harmless accident resulting from that slithering in a Paris hotel:

We approached the hotel laden down like Christmas-trees with objects of immense totemic significance and little practical value . . . we moved loudly into the Hotel Palym, which had a series of wide marble steps leading up to a gilded foyer filled with grinning menials. . . . At the very top of the flight (Father) turned to issue some command and, pivoting on quarter-inch nails, all accoutred and top-heavy as he was,

---

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 34 f.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

lost his balance, described a fairly wide arc, arms outflung, and fell. He bounced from step to step, with tins, methylated spirit flask, aluminum cooking utensils, and other hardware, ringing at each impact . . . and landed at the bottom on his back, mountain boots in the air. When he picked himself up he was full of blame, not for his mountain-boots, nor for himself for wearing such things in Paris, but for the marble steps, which he loudly proclaimed a death-trap.[14]

Furher suggestion of how unlikely Coulton was to be balanced in his judgment of the conduct of the Catholic Church during whole centuries we find in his daughter's account of another family incident:

This row started with an innocent-looking thermos flask which had been found lying on its side in the cupboard of the hotel room; and it raged unrestricted for half an hour or more, since our parent had had no major fracas for about a week, and was therefore prepared to camp out and make a field day with this one. Accusations were hurled hither and yon, his blue eyes blazed, his jaw quivered, his face got pinker and pinker, every grey hair on his head seemed to stand upright in horror at our perfidy, his minatory finger waved, Mother was dewy-eyed, we were frankly in tears—tears not of penitence but of frustrated fury—when one of us timidly mentioned a mouse as possible cause of the diasaster. . . . It made Father so mad that for a moment he was speechless. . . . It was a simple and rational explanation. But not so to Father, by then quite hysterical . . . the child who made that suggestion about the mouse was a doomed child, a damned child, a child deliberately bound toward that Hell for liars in which, I do believe, he seriously believed himself. Or rather, this child had condemned herself to a worse Hell still, the Hell in which No Responsible Person Would Employ Her.[15]

Dr. Coulton, then, was a difficult character. "Historian, propagandist, and cussed Coulton," Sarah calls him.[16] It hurt her personally, as she says, to see her father deliberately putting himself into the class of

obsessed controversialists . . . those fanatics who spend their public lives in public print, flogging this or that dead horse, airing this or that peculiarly stinking little bit of linen, without ever getting the smell out of it, because the smell is what they secretly dote upon.[17]

---

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 86.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 93 f.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 235.

During the periods of his active anti-Catholic controversies she describes him as having

> temporarily lost his reason and become something quite fiendish in consequence: a man whose mind was engrossed with Papal Bulls and Infallibilities, with Indulgences, Encyclicals, and the like; a man who spent his waking hours being very, very angry, and his sleeping hours in chewing over the rag of that anger once more in his distressed dreams: a man with an obsession, than whom no creature on earth is more difficult to live with.[18]

Is it then a matter of much wonder that the obsessed Coulton, "airing this or that peculiarly stinking little bit of linen, without ever getting the smell out of it," *because the smell is what he secretly dotes upon,* found himself consistently at odds with the Catholic Church? "There was a strain of determined contrariness in the man," his daughter adds; "to accept the *status quo* in anything was death to him, a death of the spirit."[19] But the Catholic Church is a *status quo* enduring for these nineteen hundred years. What more maddening to such a man than her reiterated refrain, "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end"?

So much then as to the dubious promise of a balanced judgment from Coulton regarding the centuries of Catholic living that he undertook to appraise. Is his performance, perhaps, better than his promise? Here we have little evidence other than his writings. As to their merit we shall confine ourselves to citations from professional critics, largely concerning ourselves with the question of Coulton's objectivity. The London *Spectator*[20] says of his *Art and the Reformation:*

> Mr. G. G. Coulton's attitude towards the Middle Ages is that of an embittered love. Its cathedrals grew, and were decorated with astonishing sculpture, in the service of a faith as yet undisturbed by what is known as the Reformation. This seems to annoy him overmuch. His learning is great, his industry unremitting, his appreciation can be acute; but his mood of prosecuting attorney becomes irritating rather than convincing.

---

[18] *Ibid.,* p. 235 f.

[19] *Ibid.,* p. 116.

[20] May 5, 1928, cf. *Book Review Digest.*

Striking even harder, the *Living Church* declares that "some of the fears of Dr. Coulton, that indefatigable *malleus Romanorum,* seem closely related to K.K.K. bugaboos."[21]

That same charge of partisanship is made of Coulton's *Life in the Middle Ages* (Vol. IV), in the *American Historical Review.*

> This book [we are told] is somewhat disappointing to review, because it is somewhat disappointing to read. . . . There is much that is interesting, more that is bizarre, but of the ordinary daily round of life, practically nothing. . . . Mr. Coulton offers for our delectation this "cream of bulky and often inaccessible volumes." The cream is a bit sour. Mr. Coulton is convinced that the evil monks do should live after them and is content that the good find its own reward. . . . *Regestrum Visitationum,* the most intimate portrayal of monastic life in the thirteenth century, has been discreetly overlooked. But then, the *Regestrum* gives one the impression that the life of the Religious was wholesome.[22]

Probably the most noteworthy of the writings from Coulton's pen is his *Five Centuries of Religion;* hence we shall give it special attention. Of its first volume we have an interesting review by Thomas Frederick Tout, Professor of History of Manchester University, President of the International Historical Congress, Brussels, President of the Medieval Section of the International Historical Congress, London, and President of the Royal Historical Society, 1925-1928. Tout was recognized as one of the two greatest authorities on the Middle Ages writing in the English language. (We shall cite both those authorities.) Tout recognizes the merits of Coulton's work, but of its objectivity he is most critical:

> This volume [he tells us] cannot be accepted as a true study either of medieval monasticism or of medieval religion. It is not, to put it bluntly, history at all. It is an able and eloquent anti-clerical pamphlet on a colossal scale. Mr. Coulton has convinced himself that medieval Catholicism is a very evil thing, and that monasticism is even worse, because it is the most characteristic embodiment of the medieval point of view. He is, therefore, out to prove how at all times, and at all seasons medieval religion is something hideous, superstitious, and untrue. . . . It is better that history should not be written at all than written in such a spirit.[23]

---

[21] Sept. 3, 1932, cf. *Book Review Digest.*
[22] July 1930, p. 905.
[23] *Scottish Historical Review,* July 1923, p. 319 f.

Tout does not deny that there are elements of truth in the picture Coulton gives of the Middle Ages, but "the falseness of the picture drawn by him remains equally glaring." Here Tout, the trained historian, reads Coulton a kindly but stern lesson:

> The first business of the historian is understanding and sympathy. . . . He may loathe the monastic ideal and disbelieve in Catholic theology and in all organized ecclesiastical systems, but, if he would appreciate the Middle Ages rightly, he must understand how it was that at certain periods a common impulse to the cloister profoundly moved the best minds in Europe, and drove them to adopt the life for which Mr. Coulton has such holy horror. . . . He must appreciate how much of the best of the civilization that we now enjoy has its roots in the Middle Ages.[24]

But Coulton will not be taught. Consequently, Tout, reviewing the next volume of *Five Centuries of Religion,* patiently resumes:

> . . . What most scholars object to in Mr. Coulton is his unhistorical mentality, his constant shriek of *ecrasez l'infame,* his utter incapacity to see anything spiritual, or progressive, or attractive in mediaeval civilisation. . . . Well, we are all ignorant, even Mr. Coulton, . . . we had better leave it at that and be content to differ from him, hoping that he will never impute to us worse crimes than ignorance.[25]

Tout, however, cannot bring himself to "leave it at that." He feels compelled to warn his readers further of the grossly partisan character of the self-righteous author:

> How can we assess aright the contributions of the friars to religious life when the whole story of their relation to the universities and to scholastic philosophy is side-tracked into a few paragraphs, while hundreds of pages set forth in wearisome detail the vices of monks and friars. . . . But it is a waste of energy to go on reviewing Mr. Coulton.

We shall close our citations from the reviews of Coulton's *Five Centuries of Religion* with a number of expressions of opinion from Sir Maurice Powicke, spoken of in the British Academy Memorial Address on Dr. Coulton[26] as "our greatest English

[24] *Ibid.,* p. 320 f.
[25] *Scottish Historical Review,* April 1928, p. 205 f.
[26] *Proceedings of the British Academy,* 1947, pp. 266-281.

medievalist." Powicke was Professor of Medieval History, University of Manchester, Regius Professor of Modern History, Oxford, and President of the Royal Historical Society.

Why [he asks] is one's admiration for this book (*Five Centuries*, Vol. I) mingled with such a profound sense of disquiet and perplexity? . . . Why, just when one would fain be convinced, does one suddenly feel that the argument is like a discussion in a dream in which ordinary critical judgment is impossible? . . . Whence comes this uneasy atmosphere of overwrought emotion, so seldom at rest, sometimes heavy with intense pathological suggestiveness? . . .[27]

Powicke points out the rashness of this self-trained historian:

A student who in other fields of medieval inquiry has learned, painfully and gradually, to appreciate the importance of the ordinary canons of criticism will be astonished to find that Mr. Coulton does not appear to consider that the use of his much more difficult sources presents any problem at all. . . .[28]

Even in the arrangement of material, Powicke charges that Coulton is grossly misleading:

Professedly this book is a history of monasticism during the eleventh and twelfth centuries; actually the great monastic movements are used as a framework of a screen upon which Mr. Coulton pastes pictures from all the coloured periodicals. Anything will do, from the legends of the Ethiopian Church to the sermons of a Franciscan contemporary of Erasmus. . . . The same disregard for historical development which allows Mr. Coulton to range through the ages enables him to give full play to his moral judgment. . . . Mr. Coulton is capable of generalisations from an incident or deductions of motive from a text which leaves us gasping at our simplemindedness.[29]

Coulton attempts a long rejoinder to those serious strictures, but Powicke is not appeased:

My complaint against Mr. Coulton is that he begs the question. He does not give a careful historical discussion of the actual growth of custom, distinguishing the authorized changes, and weighing the value of the hostile critics. . . . In raising these issues and in assuming before-

---

[27] *History*, Jan. 1924, p. 257 f.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 260 f.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 264 f.

hand that only one view can be taken of them, Mr. Coulton stirs every lover of the Middle Ages to the quick.[30]

Such charges of unfairness to the medieval Church, made by many of the most respected Protestant historians, Coulton could not simply deny. Thus, for example, he took note that Eileen Power

expressed herself once in a review to the following effect: that the public seeking my honey is somewhat disturbed by the bee which buzzes in my bonnet. I knew then, and know still, that in this there must be a fundamental truth, and a warning not to be neglected.[31]

Occasionally he would insert a few lines to acknowledge that something might be said for the medieval Church after all. Thus among his thousands of pages of indictment one may rarely find such things as,

I regard monasticism as one of the great formative forces in the social life of the Middle Ages . . . and at certain times and in certain places I would call it even the greatest and most beneficent force.[32] . . . if at any time I seem to say anything incompatible with this central judgment . . . then the contradiction will be involuntary. . . .[33]

In his eighty-fifth year he still expostulates:

There is no real paradox in supposing on the one hand that monasticism was the greatest civilizing force for some thousand years in Europe, and that, on the other, for centuries before the Reformation, honest contemporaries confessed the lamentable gulf between monastic theory and practice, and felt this gulf to be widening instead of shrinking.[34]

But Coulton has no room in his pages to picture any of the glorious phase:

The reason is that it is taught as a commonplace even in school histories. At this stage the historian's main business is to indicate the limitations within which this general statement is strictly true. . . .[35]

---

30 *History,* April 1924, p. 16.
31 *Fourscore Years,* p. 285.
32 *American Historical Review,* Jan. 1934, p. 304.
33 *Ibid.*
34 *American Historical Review,* April 1951, p. 542.
35 *American Historical Review,* April 1928, p. 634.

Those of his readers who would know "why monasticism was so great a power in the past" Coulton sends for an answer to Thomas à Kempis.[36]

One of Coulton's final and more revealing comments on his charged unfairness to Rome he makes in his autobiography:

> I felt, and feel still, that there was much unreality in the work that was being done on the Middle Ages, and even, in some conspicuous cases, scandalous literary dishonesty under the excuse of religious conviction. It was difficult, therefore, to avoid that my own books, taken by themselves, should give something of a one-sided picture. A cyclist, in a strong side wind, must needs lean consciously against the blast, and may well be betrayed into overdoing it.[37]

In a specific rejoinder to Tout's criticism that Coulton's volumes were not history at all but huge pamphlets, he rather mildly replies,

> I am not greatly concerned whether . . . what I write is not, strictly speaking, history, so long as the stuff is reasonably true, and conveys to the public a reasonably clear impression of what men did and thought in the past.[38]

However, Dr. A. C. Krey, of the University of Minnesota, does not seem to have thought that explanation satisfactory; for still later, in his review of the Coulton autobiography, he sums up the historians' anti-Coulton indictment:

> Innumerable paragraphs without immediate connection, the rapid juxtaposition of items centuries apart in time and hundreds of miles in space, an almost shameless disregard for "scholarly editions" in the citation of his authorities, an emphasis upon the shadows rather than the glamor and romance of the medieval scene, and a penchant for controversial writings have troubled his scholarly reviewers all these years.[39]

H. S. Bennett, in his Memorial Address over his friend Coulton, gave him to the ages with the admission that he

> certainly erred from a psychological point of view in insufficiently emphasizing the good in the monastic system. Not that he ignored it;

---

[36] *American Historical Review,* July 1930, p. 905.
[37] *Fourscore Years,* p. 349.
[38] *Proceedings of the British Academy,* 1947, p. 278.
[39] *American Historical Review,* Jan. 1945, p. 299.

but a few pages of white have small chance of survival among hundreds of black pages.[40]

Early in this study we remarked that eventually the trails of the two wholesalers of anti-Catholicism, Coulton and Lea, would cross. Hence near the conclusion of our remarks regarding Lea we shall again have the English historian under some scrutiny. For the present we think we can say that from our study of the man in the ordinary affairs of life we see no reason to expect from him a calm, unbiased, judicious judgment on monastic life during the Middle Ages or on the Church that sponsored that life. Coulton could qualify pretty well for the "neurotic personality of our time." The strictures passed on his work—strictures of almost unprecedented severity—by competent contemporary non-Catholic historians, were obviously justified and only what was to be expected of the work of one who so evidently "had a bee in his bonnet" whenever he wrote of Catholic affairs.

JOHN E. COOGAN, S.J.

University of Detroit
Detroit, Mich.

[40] *Proceedings of the British Academy,* 1947, p. 280.

TOWARDS AN ADEQUATE THEOLOGICAL TREATISE *DE ECCLESIA*

Scholastic theology, as we know it, is divided into a number of treatises. The obvious purpose of this arrangement is to include within the ambit of scholastic theology every truth contained within the deposit of divine public revelation. And, if this purpose is to be attained at all effectively, then each individual treatise or *tractatus* should set forth all of the divinely revealed material directly pertinent to the subject of that treatise. In other words, every treatise in scholastic theology is meant to bring out all that the Catholic *magisterium* teaches as divinely revealed doctrine about the subject covered by the treatise. It is intended to present this material precisely as it has been taught and is being taught by the *ecclesia docens.*

Thus, in an adequately formed treatise in scholastic theology there should be a statement of every truth which the Church presents as formally revealed which is directly and immediately on the subject of the *tractatus* itself. Furthermore, in an adequately organized treatise, there would be contained all of the authoritative explanations which the *magisterium* has given about these formally revealed truths, whether such explanations are presented as *de fide,* as doctrinally certain, or as *doctrina catholica.*

What is properly the work of sacred theology begins with this body of truth. Seeking as it does an intellectual penetration of the teaching Catholics accept with the assent of divine faith, the work of theological science is badly hampered if, in any individual treatise, some elements of God's supernaturally revealed message about the subject of that treatise are not considered in it. There is always the danger that such incompleteness may lead to inaccuracy in the theologian's grasp and explanation of what God actually teaches in and through His Church about the topic with which the treatise is concerned. Inaccuracy of intellectual grasp and of explanation of divinely revealed truth constitutes failure in the field of sacred theology.

In the present status of scholastic theology it is quite obvious that the treatise *De ecclesia Christi* does not contain all of the material it should. To anyone at all conversant with the books of the New Testament it is painfully clear that there are several truths about the Church which are plainly set forth in these inspired writings and which are not dealt with at all adequately in the treatise on the Church as this is now organized in the average manual of fundamental dogmatic theology. As very obvious examples, we may take two statements by Our Lord about His disciples, the members of His *ecclesia.* One of these refers to the mutual love which should be found in all the members of the Church. "By this," Our Lord said, "shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another."[1] The other has to do with the reaction which, according to Our Lord, His faithful disciples could expect from the world around them.

> These things I command you, that you love one another.
>
> If the world hate you, know ye that it hath hated me before you.
>
> If you had been of the world, the world would love its own: but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.
>
> Remember my word that I said to you: The servant is not greater than his master. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you. If they have kept my word, they will keep your word also.
>
> But all these things they will do to you for my name's sake: because they know not him that sent me.[2]

Again, if we look at the documents of the Catholic *magisterium,* we find several truths about the Church which are not presented in anything like an adequate fashion in the treatises on the Church in the contemporary manuals of fundamental dogmatic theology. One great example of this is to be found in the truth stated in the opening sentences of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Humanum genus.*

> The race of man, after its miserable fall from God, the Creator and the Giver of heavenly gifts, "through the envy of the devil," separated into two diverse and opposite parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other for those things which are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is the kingdom of God on earth, namely, the true Church of Jesus Christ; and those who desire from their

---

[1] *John* 13: 35. [2] *John* 15: 17-21.

heart to be united with it, so as to gain salvation, must of necessity serve God and His only-begotten Son with their whole mind and with an entire will. The other is the kingdom of Satan, in whose possession and control are all whosoever follow the fatal example of their leader and of our first parents, those who refuse to obey the divine and eternal law, and who have many aims of their own in contempt of God, and many aims also against God.

This twofold kingdom St. Augustine keenly discerned and described after the manner of two cities, contrary in their laws because striving for contrary objects; and with a subtle brevity he expressed the efficient cause of each in these words: "Two loves formed two cities: the love of self, reaching even to contempt of God, an earthly city; and the love of God, reaching to contempt of self, a heavenly one." At every period of time each has been in conflict with the other, with a variety and multiplicity of weapons and of warfare, although not always with equal ardor and assault.[3]

Truths like these are distinct and essentially important parts of Catholic doctrine about the Church itself. The man who knows some of the revealed teachings about the Catholic Church, but who is unaware of these God-given doctrines about it, has an essentially inadequate concept of the *ecclesia.* And if, as a result of careless teaching, he comes to accept as true certain assumptions incompatible with the doctrines which are actually a part of the Church's deposit of revealed truth, but which are not considered in a sufficiently adequate and explicit way in the scholastic treatises *de ecclesia,* he will have fallen into serious error about the Church itself.

The incompleteness of the ordinary textbook treatise *de ecclesia* has a highly interesting historical background. Even a sketchy knowledge of that background is essential if we are to ascertain how this treatise should be and can be improved by the theologians of our own time.

In the first place, it is important to remember that the treatise on the Church is a comparative latecomer in the realm of scholastic theology strictly so called. Other treatises, like the ones on the Trinity and on grace, developed in the schools at the hands of teachers who employed Peter the Lombard's Four Books of Sentences and St. Thomas' *Summa theologica* as master texts. For

[3] Translation in Father Wynne's edition of *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 83.

generations in the schools of the Catholic Church scholastic theology was *de facto* the explanation of the topics covered in the *Sententiae* and in the *Summa*. Neither of these classics included anything like a complete treatise on the Church of Christ.

As a matter of fact, much of the material now covered in the scholastic *tractatus de ecclesia* was covered in the *Decretum* of Gratian. Thus, in the actual procedure of the schools, a great deal of the material on the Church was covered primarily from a canonical rather than from a theological angle. Of course the material covered by Gratian and the other canonists was perfectly within their own field, the realm of what is now called public ecclesiastical law. At the same time, it was definitely a misfortune that, during the early period of scholastic theology, there was no such thing as a properly scholastic treatise on the Church included in the regular course of sacred theology. This treatise did not enter into the literature and the course of properly scholastic theology until almost the end of the sixteenth century.

This is not to say that there was no theological writing on or treatment of the Church until the late fifteen hundreds. Actually we can find a brief but highly competent and illuminating treatise on the Church included in the mid-thirteenth-century work of Moneta of Cremona against the Waldensians and the Albigensians.[4] There is a brief beginning of a treatise in the *Commentary on the Apostles' Creed,* written by St. Thomas himself, and much more in the same Saint's *Contra errores Graecorum.* And in the fourteenth century James of Viterbo published his *De regimine christiano,* which Arquillière edited in 1926 and called "the oldest treatise on the Church." Likewise there is a well developed *tractatus de ecclesia* to be found in the fourteenth-century Alvaro Pelayo's *De planctu ecclesiae,* and another in Thomas Netter of Walden's *Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei ecclesiae catholicae.* And the treatise on the Church may be said to have achieved its classical form in Cardinal John de Turrecremata's great fifteenth-century *Summa de ecclesia.*

For the most part, however, these pre-Reformation works on the Church, even the *Summa de ecclesia* itself, were pre-eminently

[4] *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque* by Moneta of Cremona was published in Rome in 1743. The section on the Church begins with the first chapter of the fifth book.

polemical rather than strictly scholastic in orientation. We must realize, of course, that polemical and scholastic are by no means completely diverse categories. The *Four Books of Sentences* are the great classical models of scholastic writings, and they were intended by their author "to defend our faith against the errors of carnal and brutish men with the shields of the tower of David, or rather to show that it is thus defended."[5] Yet, despite the fact that all theological writing or teaching is to a certain extent argumentative or polemical, it must be admitted that much of the pre-Reformation theological treatises on the Church owed their formation and orientation to some individual controversy. They were written, as a rule, not to bring out all of the revealed teachings on the subject of Our Lord's Mystical Body, but merely to explain that section of the divinely revealed doctrine about the Church which could serve to prove the Catholic thesis in some individual polemic.

By all means the most perfect and the most influential pre-Reformation writing on the Church was Turrecremata's *Summa de ecclesia.* This work is divided into four books. The first of these deals with the universal Church. The second treats of "the Roman Church and the primacy of its Pontiff." The third book has to do with "universal councils and their authority." The fourth is subdivided into two sections, treatises on schism and heresy.

Turrecremata wrote his masterpiece "against the adversaries of this Church of God and of the primacy of St. Peter."[6] Like Peter the Lombard centuries before him, Turrecremata declared his intention to maifest *"ecclesiam Christi ex davidica turre clipeis pendentibus tutatam praemunitamque."*[7] Yet, for all of its polemical approach, the *Summa de ecclesia* was able to set forth the summation of all the previous scholastic teaching about the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. Had the *tractatus de ecclesia* entered into the fabric of scholastic theology in the status to which Turrecremata had lifted it in the *Summa de ecclesia,* the history of the scholastic treatise on the Church would have been quite different from what it actually has been.

The *Summa de ecclesia* was written towards the middle of the fifteenth century. The Protestant Reformation began during the

[5] *Libri IV sententiarum, prologus,* in the Quarrachi edition of 1916, I, 1.
[6] *Summa de ecclesia, prologus,* in the Venice edition of 1561, p. 1v.
[7] *Ibid.*

last years of that same century. And, in their intellectually triumphant polemic against the heretics of the time, the Catholic Counter-Reformation theologians actually set up the outline of a treatise on the Church which was destined to enter into the fabric of scholastic theology.

By reason of bitterness and the importance of the controversy in which they were engaged, the Catholic writers who opposed the heresies of the Reformers tended to limit themselves to theses actually in dispute. A striking illustration of their procedure is to be found in one of the most important Catholic books of the period, Peter Soto's *Assertio catholicae fidei circa articulos confessionis nomine illustrissimi Ducis Wirtenbergensis oblatae per legatos eius Concilio Tridentino.* The document Peter Soto set out to criticize was merely a typical Protestant formula of belief.

In his formidably titled book, Soto printed the text of the Protestant formula in the left hand column of the *verso* page, the one which would be numbered with an even number in a modern printed volume. The right hand column of the same page was devoted to his comments on each individual article of the formula which was opposed to Catholic truth. The *recto* page contained his organized text.

This formula, like other heretical professions, contained, along with articles contradicting God's revealed message, many other statements which were simply taken from the teaching of the Catholic Church. Soto and the Catholic Counter-Reformation theologians in general confined themselves to a discussion of the Protestant teachings which were erroneous. And, in the field of ecclesiology, this procedure turned out to have strikingly unfortunate repercussions.

The central ecclesiological controversy at the time of the Reformation had to do with the location or the identity of God's supernatural kingdom on earth. The Protestant writers did not dispute the existence of a genuine *ecclesia Christi* in this world. They, like the Catholic theologians, held that there could not be any salvation outside of this true *ecclesia.* Where they departed from revealed truth was in their contention that this supernatural kingdom of God on earth was not the organized religious society over which the successor of St. Peter presides but something invis-

ible, the sum-total of all good or predestined men and women on earth.

Hence, in their polemical writings, the Counter-Reformation theologians tended to pass over the teachings about the nature and prerogatives of the true *ecclesia* as such and to concentrate on the task of proving that this social unit is actually identified, in the status of the New Testament, with the religious society over which the Bishop of Rome presides as the Vicar of Christ and as the successor of St. Peter. And, since the heretics had denied that the teaching of the Catholic *magisterium* is actually the immediate rule of Christian faith, brilliant theologians like Stapleton tended to focus their teaching on the Church on the point that its teaching is divinely established as normative for the acceptance of divine public revelation by the act of faith.

For the most part the earlier Counter-Reformation theologians wrote as brilliant polemical pamphleteers. They wrote their doctrine *de ecclesia* without any special regard for arrangement in the body of scholastic theology. Indeed, as far as most of them were concerned, such teachings were merely located in the order in which the heretics themselves had placed their denials of Catholic truth in their own professions of belief. There were, of course, exceptions. Driedo, to give only one example, integrated his treatise on the Church into his magnificent *De ecclesiasticis scripturis et dogmatibus*. In this work the first book deals with the catalog of Sacred Scripture, and the second with the various translations and expositions of Scripture, along with the different senses in which the teaching of the inspired books can be understood. The third book is concerned with "certain brief rules and dogmas by which students are aided in understanding the obscure places and in discerning the literal and mystical meanings of Sacred Scripture." The fourth book is devoted to the study of tradition and of the Church.

The location of the treatise on the Church which had been sketched by Driedo received its lasting classical form in Melchior Cano's famous *De locis theologicis*. Cano listed the authority of the universal Church as the third among his ten *loci theologici* and he devoted the rather brief fourth book of his masterpiece to a study of this source. In this fourth book he studied the definition and the membership of the Church as well as its authority in the field of sacred doctrine.

What was destined to be by far the most influential treatise on the Church yet to appear in the literature of sacred theology was St. Robert Bellarmine's *De ecclesia militante*. The first chapter of this book is devoted to various meanings attached to the word *"ecclesia."* The second leads to and centers around the famous Bellarminian definition of the Church, a definition which indicates the true kingdom of God of the New Testament in terms of its membership. The next eight chapters are devoted to an analysis and proof of St. Robert's contention that the true Church militant of the New Dispensation is actually a visible society, the company of those united in the profession of the same Christian faith and in the communion of the same Sacraments, under the rule of legitimate ecclesiastical pastors, and ultimately under the rule of the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth. The last seven chapters of the *De ecclesia militante* deal with the indefectibility and the infallibility of the Church.

With St. Robert the allocation of the treatise on the Church in the field of sacred theology went far beyond the beginnings made by Driedo and even the classical order of Cano's *De locis theologicis*. The *De ecclesia militante* is a part of the first folio volume of St. Robert's *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*. This first volume is composed of seven "Controversies," each one of which is subdivided into a certain number of "Books." The seven "Controversies" are, (1) On Scripture and Tradition, (2) On Christ, the Head of the entire Church, (3) On the Supreme Pontiff, (4) On the Councils and the Church, (5) On the members of the Church, (6) On the Church in Purgatory, and (7) On the Church Triumphant. The second volume deals with the Sacraments and the third with original sin and with grace.

The arrangement made by St. Robert was in the field of polemical rather than of strictly scholastic theology. After the death of Estius, the last important commentator of Peter the Lombard, the main current of strictly scholastic theology continued along the line of commentaries on the *Summa theologica*, and of "Theological Courses" based upon St. Thomas' text. Among the younger contemporaries of St. Robert, some, like Francis Sylvius, relegated the treatise on the Church to the realm of polemical theology. There is no treatise on the Church in Sylvius' great scholastic work, his

commentary on the *Summa*. Such a treatise is found, however, in Sylvius' *De praecipuis fidei nostrae orthodoxae controversiis cum nostris haereticis*. This work considers the first seven of Cano's *loci*. Its section on the Church considers the definition of the Church, its membership, its visibility and its notes, its origin and its indefectibility, and its doctrinal authority.

The half century that elapsed between the publication of St. Robert's *Controversies* (1584) and those of Sylvius (1638) saw the first attempts at inclusion of the treatise on the Church within the fabric of strictly scholastic theology. This was a period of transition between the commentaries in the proper sense of the word, the explanations of the text of the *Summa* article by article, and the classical *"curus theologici"* which developed out of these commentaries, and which finally crystallized into the form of the contemporary manual of sacred theology. Commentaries like those of Bannez and Wiggers included a *tractatus de ecclesia* as a kind of appendix to the explanation of the tenth article of the first question of the *Summa's secunda secundae*. Suarez, Tanner, and Gregory of Valentia integrated treatises on the Church into their scholastic writings on the virtue of faith. Where most of the others treated the Church, the Roman Pontiff, and the Councils in this context, John of St. Thomas contented himself with a treatise on the Roman Pontiff alone. The custom of locating the treatise on the Church within or as an appendix to the *tractatus de fide* was prevalent until late in the eighteenth century. Billuart himself followed this procedure.

Unfortunately, however, the treatise on the Church which finally became incorporated into the course of strictly scholastic theology was, in the last analysis, only the material which had been set forth in polemical theology by the great Counter-Reformation writers. Two points were stressed, the fact that the visible society living under the leadership of the Roman Pontiff is actually the true *ecclesia* of the New Testament (in the theses on the membership and the notes of the Church), and the position of the Church as the immediate norm of Christian faith. With these there was usually some discussion of the origin and the indefectibility of the Church. And it is interesting to note that well into the seventeenth century, in the *Controversies* of Sylvius, the teaching on origin of the Church proved that the Church militant as such had started

to exist in the days of our first parents, and that the Church militant of the New Testament began in the days of Our Lord's public life on earth.

The treatise on the Church was destined to appear in the course of scholastic theology under yet another approach, that of apologetics. The section of fundamental dogmatic theology we know now as apologetics or the *tractatus de revelatione* was the latest entrant into the organization of scholastic theology. The treatise may be said to have assumed its scientific form with the publication of Hooke's *Religionis naturalis et revelatae principia* in 1752. It necessarily included material about the foundation of the Church militant of the New Testament, and, during the course of the nineteenth century, it tended to be accompanied by a treatise on the Church as the rule of faith and to be divided into a *demonstratio christiana* and a *demonstratio catholica*. Eventually this procedure resulted in the division of the *tractatus de ecclesia* itself into a *pars apologetica* and a *pars theologica*.

During the nineteenth century and during the early days of the twentieth the treatise on the Church assumed the form it now possesses in the manuals. Four tendencies characterized this movement. First, there was a tendency to develop the thesis on the foundation of the Church militant of the New Testament and at the same time to abandon the equally theological thesis about the establishment of God's supernatural kingdom on earth during the days of our first parents. At the hands of theologians like Dieckmann the thesis on the foundation of the Church militant of the New Testament became somewhat obscured by an explanation of the term "kingdom of God" which took the form of a polemic against Loisy and was not anything like an adequate exposition of the theology of the kingdom.

The second characteristic of the development of the *tractatus de ecclesia* in the manuals of scholastic theology during the last century has been the tendency to introduce most of the material of the old treatises on the Roman Pontiff and a little of the material of the old treatises on the Councils into the fabric of the scholastic treatise on the Church. The third characteristic has been the tendency to develop the theological teaching on the *magisterium* of the Roman Pontiff and of the *ecclesia docens* in terms of distinctions between solemn and ordinary pronouncements and between

doctrinal statements which are authoritative and infallible and others which are authoritative without being infallible. The last of these characteristics has been the incipient but still noticeable attempt to supply the manifest inadequacies of the *tractatus de ecclesia* by inserting material about the purpose of the Church and the relation of this society to Our Lord and to the Blessed Virgin. which are authoritative without being infallible. The last of these characteristics has been the incipient but still noticeable attempt to supply the manifest inadequacies of the *tractatus de ecclesia* by inserting material about the purpose of the Church and the relation of this society to Our Lord and to the Blessed Virgin.

Nevertheless, despite these attempts, the scholastic treatise on the Church, as it is found in the ordinary seminary manual of our own time, remains a tragically inadequate affair. Essentially this treatise is still the polemic rather than the properly scholastic study of God's supernatural kingdom on earth. It still does not represent an attempt to summarize in one section of scholastic theology all of the divinely revealed teaching about the true Church of Jesus Christ.

It would seem to be the task of the theologians of our day to fill out and to perfect this treatise. It will obviously be a work which will demand a tremendous amount of study and of prayer. It will not, of course, call for the composition of new sections of sacred theology. It will, in the main, consist essentially in the process of integrating into the *tractatus de ecclesia* portions of sacred theology which have already been developed but which have not been dealt with in scholastic theology until now as belonging to the treatise on the Church.

In times past there have always been legitimate sections of theological science which have existed, as it were, in the shadow of or at the periphery of the body of properly scholastic theology. During mediaeval times the treatise on the Church as a whole occupied such a position. The divinely revealed teaching on the true Church, which should have been treated in the regular course of scholastic theology, was relegated to the realm of polemics and of canonical studies. Today there are instances of theses being treated in the

field of spiritual or pastoral theology when these same teachings actually belong within the fabric of the scholastic *tractatus de ecclesia.*

One of the outstanding inadequacies in the present-day scholastic treatise on the Church is to be found in the treatment of the purpose of the Church itself. On this subject it is definitely not enough to assure the student that the Catholic Church is orientated towards the attainment of God's glory through the fullness of Christ in the salvation of souls. It is imperative that there should be incorporated into the scholastic treatise on the Church what God has taught us, in great measure through the Epistles of St. Paul, about the proper and immediate purpose of the society of which His Son is the Head. Today this material is covered to a great extent in theological manuals of spirituality dealing with the obligations of Bishops and of the priests whom the Bishops employ as their representatives and their instruments in the care of souls. This material should be brought into and developed within the scholastic treatise on the Church.

Another field within which most contemporary manuals of theology are inadequate in their treatment of the Church is the teaching about the characteristics of the kingdom of God on earth as such. Older writings, like Turrecremata's *Summa de ecclesia,* dealt with this material under the heading of the names assigned in Scripture and in tradition to the Church and to its members. In the last analysis, this teaching comes out as a description of the Church in terms of four dimensions: the relations of the Church to God, and to the sacred humanity of Christ, and to Our Lady; to the kingdom of God in the old dispensation; to the Church triumphant, and to the social unit designated by Pope Leo XIII the kingdom of Satan. The absence of an adequate treatment of this section of the theological teaching about the Church in most of our contemporary manuals has had a most unfortunate effect on the theological culture of our times.

Again, in its primarily polemical emphasis on the jurisdictional and doctrinal authority of the Catholic hierarchy, contemporary scholastic theology on the Church has almost lost sight of the tremendous responsibility involved in the care of souls. Since the

issuance of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* it has been common Catholic teaching that diocesan Bishops derive their power of jurisdiction from Our Lord by way of the Roman Pontiff.[8] In other words, there was one sovereign grant of authority by Our Lord to His Church, the grant described in the lines of St. John's Gospel which tell that Our Lord commissioned St. Peter to feed or take care of His lambs and His sheep.[9] All of the legitimate ecclesiastical authority which has been exercised since that day has been founded on that commission.

In granting that commission, Our Lord certainly endowed St. Peter, and through him the other members of the apostolic college, with genuine jurisdictional authority. At the same time, however, He imposed a heavy responsibility upon them. He charged them with the obligation of taking care of the spiritual welfare of the men and women for whom He died. And it is certainly well within the competence of an adequate treatise on the Catholic Church to study and to state the serious and the extent of that obligation.

Finally, there is the question of the function of mutual charity within Our Lord's *ecclesia*. In general, the contemporary manuals of sacred theology tend to limit their explanation of the function of charity within the Church to explanations about the note of unity. The obligation, clearly manifest in the New Testament, whereby the men and woman of the true Church are bound to have a special and active supernatural affection for one another as brothers and sisters in Christ, has been almost completely passed over in the manuals now in common use in our seminaries. An unfortunate effect of the neglect of this important teaching has been the appearance of writings by Catholics protesting against group consciousness or social solidarity among their co-religionists. Such writings, in the final analysis, harm our people by presenting as an acceptable Catholic attitude what is actually something radically opposed to Our Lord's teaching about His Church.

Thus, to bring about a more adequate statement of the theological treatise *de ecclesia* in our own time, several theses now

[8] Cf. Cardinal Ottaviani, *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici*, 3rd edition (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1947), I, 413; and Fenton, "The Doctrinal Authority of Papal Encyclicals," Part I, in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXI, 2 (Aug. 1949), 149 f.

[9] Cf. *John* 21 : 15-17.

allocated principally within the fields of biblical, spiritual, and pastoral theology will have to be brought within the field of this treatise on the Church. Unquestionably some sections of the *tractatus de ecclesia* as it exists today will have to be radically re-organized. Thus there must be a renewed study of the notes of the Church, and a willingness to bring together and to explain all of what has been divinely revealed about the unity of the Church. Hitherto the concept of the "note of the Church" has all-too frequently been a kind of Procrustean bed into which all the theological teachings on the unity and the holiness of the Church had to be fitted. In line with this tendency all the material in the deposit of faith on the subject of the Church's unity has been considered primarily from the point of view of a unity which would manifest the Catholic Church as the true supernatural kingdom of God on earth. Actually the revealed teachings on the unity of the Church can more properly and adequately be studied first for their own sake, without immediate reference to the workings of the "notes of the Church."

Another thesis which should be recast in the interest of a more adequate *tractatus de ecclesia* in the scholastic manuals of sacred theology is the one on the necessity of the Catholic Church for the attainment of eternal salvation. Treated by itself in the works of pre-Reformation theologians like Turrecremata, this thesis received scant direct attention in the writings of the Counter-Reformation controversialists, since the Protestant heretics were as willing as their Catholic opponents to admit that there is no salvation outside of God's true *ecclesia*. As a matter of fact this essential part of divine teaching about the Church entered into the writings of the classical Catholic polemicists as it were through the back door. St. Robert's *De ecclesia militante* first takes cognizance of it in the consideration of an objection against his thesis that catechumens are not members of the Church.[10] In the writings of men like St. Robert the teaching on the necessity of the Church for the attainment of eternal salvation was treated primarily for the sake of showing that a man could be "within" the Church in such a way as to achieve salvation without actually being a member of the Church. And it is in line with this same tendency that the

[10] Cf. *De ecclesia militante*, c. 3.

thesis appears in many of the contemporary seminary manuals of scholastic theology.

This teaching is, of course, accurate. It is likewise a necessary part of the Catholic explanation of the divinely revealed teaching that there is no salvation outside of the Catholic Church. Nevertheless the basic element in any fully adequate presentation of this thesis should be the evidence in the content of divine revelation that, by God's own institution, a man must pass from this life "within" the Mystical Body of His Son if he is to attain to the eternal glory of the Beatific Vision.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

DELEGATED SURGICAL PROCEDURES

Question: When a surgeon has agreed to perform an operation on a patient, may he, in the course of the operation, delegate some of the procedures to the younger doctors who are assisting him? This practice seems to be fairly common, at least in some hospitals. The reason alleged in justification is that a young surgeon should have some supervised experience before he begins to operate independently; and the only way in which he can acquire such experience is to perform a portion of an operation under the watcful eye of an older surgeon. What is to be said of the morality of this practice?

Answer: It would seem that if the requisite conditions are observed, the practice in question can be permitted. Certainly, it is beneficial for society that surgeons have some experience under the guidance of older doctors before they begin to operate on their own responsibility; and the process suggested seems to be the only way in which such experience can be obtained. However, it must be emphasized that in order to justify this practice from the moral standpoint, certain conditions must be observed, especially the following. First, whatever the younger surgeon is permitted to do in the course of the operation must be carefully supervised by the surgeon in charge of the operation. Certainly, it would be gravely wrong for the latter to leave the operating room, letting a beginner perform any portion of the operation without direct guidance, unless it is some simple procedure which even the youngest surgeon is able to perform without any danger. Second, the doctor in charge must have full assurance that the younger surgeon is entirely capable of performing the task assigned to him, without any risk to the patient. Third, if the patient previously demanded that the senior surgeon perform the entire operation and this latter has agreed, then he is bound in justice to abide by this contract, and depute no portion of the operation to another.

In connection with the last condition, it might be asked if the positive consent of the patient is necessary beforehand to justify the

process described. It would seem that this is not necessary. The average person about to undergo an operation presumably trusts the surgeon in charge, leaving it to his discretion to choose what to do by himself and what to assign to be done by others. For everyone knows that in the course of an operation some functions are performed by the assistants. Hence, if the patient lays down no explicit conditions on this matter, I believe that the surgeon in charge may take it on himself to assign some procedures to the younger doctors, always presuming (to repeat) that he strictly supervises the entire operation and is assured that no harm will come to the patient through the deputation of an assistant to some portion of the surgery.

Above all, care must be observed that the practice described shall not lead to the detestable practice known as "ghost surgery." This means that a surgeon makes arrangements with a patient to perform an operation, which he knows is beyond his own ability, and then without the knowledge of the patient, hires another surgeon who enters the operating room after the patient is unconscious and performs the operation. The patient pays the doctor with whom he made the contract, unaware that he had no part in the surgical procedure; and the fee is split between the two doctors. As is very evident, such an unethical method brings disgrace on the honorable medical profession.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Question: There are many non-Catholic educators nowadays who wish to introduce in our public schools a course in religion. Their objective is to give the pupils those basic truths that would be acceptable to Catholics, Protestants and Jews, such as the existence of a personal God, the efficacy and the obligation of prayer, the duty of being honest, chaste, truthful, etc. through obedience to the Creator—in a word, those religious truths that can be perceived by natural reason. Could Catholics consistently support such a program?

Answer: This is a very complicated and far-reaching problem, subject to many particular circumstances and conditions, and doubtless a variety of solutions would be offered by different Catholic

theologians and educators. As far as I can visualize the problem, however, there are two distinct questions involved: First, is it compatible with Catholic theological principles to introduce into our public schools a program of religious education whereby children of all creeds will be instructed in certain general religious principles, acceptable to Catholics, Protestants and Jews? Second (presuming an affirmative answer to the first question), is it prudent for Catholics to support such a type of religious training, as a procedure that will be spiritually helpful to the pupils of our public schools, and will cause no harm, particularly to our Catholic children?

To the first question I would answer that to introduce into our public schools a course of instruction in natural religious truths—those truths that are perceptible by the light of reason and are accepted by intelligent persons of all religious beliefs—would not be opposed to any Catholic principle. Certainly, such a course does not present the complete content of the truths and precepts that God requires all men to accept; but it is better than nothing, and in view of the fact that there is no opportunity of teaching the children the truths of divine revelation, instructions based on religious doctrine known by the light of reason could be favored by Catholics.

To answer the other question adequately, the practicality of introducing such a course of religious instruction, many circumstances would have to be taken into consideration. Undoubtedly, there are many public school teachers who are incapable of teaching correctly even the fundamental tenets of religion. Some would intersperse the course with their own extreme views, such as pantheism; others would make the class an occasion for proposing their sectarian beliefs and of ridiculing those who held other views. Because of such eventualities some Catholics have concluded that in practice it is better to keep all religious instruction out of our public schools.

Others, however, believe that the benefits produced by some general religious instruction, even on the purely natural scale, would outweigh the unfortunate consequences that would sometimes take place, and thus could be justified on the principle of the double effect. When we realize that there are millions of children in our public schools today who are receiving practically no religious instruction or inspiration, this view demands our thoughtful attention. Catholics should remember that they are supposed to be concerned, not only with Catholic children, but also with the non-Catholic

children of our nation. The prevalence of juvenile delinquency in America today—due in great measure to the lack of religious training of our growing boys and girls—seems to call urgently for something in our public school curriculum that will impress on these children the existence of God and their obligation to obey His laws. I believe that it is better to run our chances of distorted teaching rather than deny millions of children at least the rudimentary knowledge of the most important phase of life.

Some have advocated as a kind of compromise the teaching of religion on a factual basis—a course of instruction on what Catholics, Protestants and Jews believe, without any attempt to present any doctrines as actually true. I do not favor this procedure, for I believe that it would do little more than give the children the impression that the religious beliefs that exist in the world are nothing more than myths, similar to the ideas of the gods that prevailed among the ancient Greeks and Romans.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

CHALICE INTERIOR

Question: I received a sterling silver chalice recently from a generous benefactor. The chalice is to be used in a chapel of Sisters, who have the custom of having all their sacred objects in silver only. Must I have the inside of the cup and the paten, which are pure silver, gold plated in order to be consecrated? Some authors indicate that it is not necessary. What must I do?

Answer: The *Missale Romanum* states that the inside of the cup of the chalice and the paten must be gold-plated. The Code of Canon Law (Can. 1305, §2) implies the same when it states that there is a grave obligation to have the inside of the chalice cup and paten replated with gold, once it wears off. Father O'Connell in his recent work, *Consecranda,* states specifically in the preliminary notes to the consecration of the chalice and paten that the inside of the cup must be gilt and that the concave side of the paten should be the same.

ROSE-COLORED VESTMENTS

Question: Kindly answer in your column the following questions. When rose-colored vestments are used on Laetare and Gaudete Sundays *may* or *must* the tabernacle veil be rose and similarly the antependium? At High Mass must the tunic and dalmatic and humeral veil all be rose-colored if the chasuble is rose. In Advent if a *de ea* occurs during the week following Gaudete Sunday may rose-colored vestments be used?

Answer: The tabernacle veil and antependium need not be rose-colored even though rose-colored vestments are used for Mass. It would be the ideal situation but it is not necessary.

We would find it a very strange situation and I am sure the faithful too, if the priest appeared in rose-colored vestments while the deacon and subdeacon wore purple or violet dalmatic and tunic. Common sense would dictate that we use the same color for all the vestments worn by the officers of the High Mass. Furthermore, let us keep in mind that the rose-colored vestments are not prescribed for these two Sundays but are approved as a substitute for violet vestments.

The Congregation of Sacred Rites (Nov. 7, 1935) directed that rose-colored vestments may be worn on Monday, Tuesday or Thursday following Gaudete Sunday, provided a ferial office falls on these days.

BENEDICTION PROBLEMS

Question: What is meant by a "thabor"? I have noticed in some places the celebrant sings the *Panem de caelo* and at other places the choir intones it. Just what is the correct practice?

Answer: The thabor is a small stand about the dimensions of a missal stand, usually made of metal and elaborately decorated. It is used in some churches for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, at which time the monstrance rests upon it. The thabor is only tolerated and those rubricists who justify its existance permit it when the monstrance is small and cannot easily be seen by the faithful. It is more proper to place the monstrance on the *mensa* of the altar rather than on a thabor.

Father Barry in his *Matters Liturgical* states that it is the accepted practice in many places to have the celebrant sing the *Panem de caelo,* though strictly it should be sung by two chanters. (S.R.C., 1265, 7.)

FUNERAL MASS, WHEN PERMITTED?

Question: The indult of Aug. 16, 1940 of the Congregation of Sacred Rites states that a funeral Mass with corpse present is permitted in the United States on all Double Feasts of the First Class that are not of obligation in the United States, except the last three days of Holy Week and the Feasts of the Epiphany and Corpus Christi. This indult makes no mention of permitting a funeral Mass on the feast itself if the external solemnity is transferred to the following Sunday. Does this mean that the 1940 indult overrules the custom of having funeral Masses on the feast when the external solemnity is transferred to the following Sunday?

Answer: The indult referred to is specifically given to the United States. These days are excepted and it would seem that these days must be kept especially sacred. The transferal of their solemnity is an additional privilege and purely accidental since proper reverence and ceremony cannot be given on the day itself, due to working conditions and other circumstances beyond our control. We do not see that one would be justified in conducting a funeral Mass with the corpse present, even though the actual solemnity of the feast was transferred to the following Sunday.

ALTAR DECORATIONS

Question: I have always been under the impression that relics and flowers were the only ornaments allowed on the altar. Recently, I was told that a certain church had a harvest blessing and that the altar was decorated with corn stalks. Is this permitted?

Answer: The practice of decorating the altar with flowers is approved and commended but not prescribed. We are permitted to adorn the altar with palms on Palm Sunday. We have never heard of decorating an altar with corn stalks, which seems not only a

complete violation of liturgical law but of good ordinary ecclesiastical propriety.

REQUIEM OR VOTIVE MASS

Question: What is the obligation in offering Masses requested for the dead? Must these Masses be "Requiem" when the Ordo permits or, out of a spirit of liturgical devotion and the desire to permit daily following of the proper Mass of the day on the part of those attending a parish Mass, may the celebrant offer a Mass of the day for the dead? Is the dead person deprived of any fruits of the Mass by the omission of the Requiem Mass?

Answer: Mass is Mass and the fruits are the same, regardless whether it is a Requiem Mass or the Mass of the day. One is not obliged to celebrate a votive Mass or a Requiem Mass instead of the Mass indicated by the Ordo unless such a Mass has been specifically requested by the donor of the stipend and such a request can be granted by the requirements of the Ordo for that particular day. Many priests find the *Missa quotidiana* monotonous and prefer not saying it each and every time a votive or Requiem Mass is permitted. In fact, we feel it is far better to have priests offer the various votive Masses listed in the Missal than repeat Requiem Mass too frequently. Our needs are many and it would be well for us to acquaint ourselves with the various votive Masses in our Missals. It does seem somewhat incongruous for us to offer a Requiem Mass on the first Friday, dedicated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, when a votive Mass is permitted. All of this of course, if the donor of the stipend has not specifically requested a Requiem Mass.

INTERIOR OF METAL TABERNACLE

Question: If the tabernacle is made of metal and gold-surfaced is it necessary to veil the interior?

Answer: Matters Liturgical states the following on this problem: "If the tabernacle is of wood, the interior should be surfaced with gold-leaf or gilt or be lined with silk or cloth of gold or silver (S.C.R., 3254, 3709, 4035). If the tabernacle is of marble or metal,

the interior should be lined with cedar or with some similar wood as a protection against dampness; this wood shall then be adorned as explained above." Strictly speaking we feel that the law would be fulfilled if the metal interior is gold-surfaced. However, the general practice is to line its interior with silk.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

THE RELIGIOUS CONFESSOR AND CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS

Question: May the confessor in a religious house vote on the candidates for orders?

Answer: This particular question is not treated explicitly in the Code of Canon Law although there seems to be a parallel in the law for secular seminaries. Canon 1361, §3, which deals with confessors in a secular seminary states that the confessor's vote should never be sought when it is a question of expelling a seminarian or of promoting him to orders. Many benefits are easily discernible in the observances of this law. Although someone might question its application to the religious seminary, is seems that the purpose of the law is the same in either case and, therefore, that the confessor in the religious house should refrain from expressing his opinion regarding regular penitents who are being discussed in regard to advancement to orders.

WITNESSES FOR MARRIAGE

Question: What is the required age for witnesses to marriage?

Answer: The Code establishes no specific age for witnesses to a marriage. Strictly speaking, all that is required of the witnesses is that they have the use of reason and be capable of bearing witness to the fact that a marriage has taken place. It seems, however, that the witnesses should not only enjoy the use of reason but, also, that they should have attained the age of puberty at least. Although it is customary that they be of different sexes, this is not required by

law. Non-Catholics or persons under ecclesiastical censure may not lawfully be witnesses unless a justifying reason exists and danger of scandal be removed. To insure against the possibility of scandal, permission of the local Ordinary must be sought in each instance. Finally, it should be noted that the physical presence of the witnesses is necessary and, therefore, it is not permissible to witness a marriage by telephone, radio, or television.

SCAPULAR FACULTIES AGAIN

Question: May a priest enrol the faithful in any of the five scapulars in virtue of his *pagellum* of faculties which grants the right to enrol in the five scapulars under one form?

Answer: The faculty to enrol the faithful in the five scapulars under one form is granted in many dioceses in the *pagellum* of faculties granted to priests. The same privilege is also acquired through annual or lifetime memberships in certain societies. The faculty thus acquired presupposes, however, the fact that the priest already enjoys faculties to enrol in each of the five scapulars. The priest, therefore, who lacks authorization to enrol in the individual scapulars cannot validly enrol a person in any of the scapulars in virtue of this particular privilege.

DIVINE OFFICE IN THE VERNACULAR

Question: Does recitation of the divine office in the vernacular satisfy one's obligation to recite the office?

Answer: Such a procedure might conceivably benefit an individual by familiarizing him with the correct meaning of various parts of the office. Unfortunately, however, such a recitation in the vernacular does not satisfy the obligation. Clerics in major orders are obliged to the recitation of the office according to the proper and approved liturgical books (canon 135). Commentators all agree that the Latin version is the approved liturgical version for the Latin rite and, therefore, recitation in the vernacular would satisfy only in the event that the individual enjoyed a special indult permitting the use of the vernacular.

NUMBER OF BEADS FOR A ROSARY

Question: Is a rosary correctly made if the introductory beads (one large, three small, and another large) are omitted?

Answer: The devout and complete recitation of the rosary requires the recitation of the *Our Father* once and the *Hail Mary* ten times for each decade, together with meditation on the mystery commemorated. The origin of the five beads referred to is obscure. It is certain, however, that they are not necessary for gaining the indulgences attached to the recitation of the rosary. Privately one may gain the rosary indulgences whether or not he recites additional prayers on these beads. When the rosary is recited publicly local custom should be followed so that these prayers will be recited where it is customary. Widespread custom in the United States calls for the recitation of the *Creed,* an *Our Father,* the *Hail Mary* three times, and the *Gloria Patri* once before the recitation of the decades

BAPTISM OF INFANTS

Question: How soon after birth should baptism be administered to an infant?

Answer: Baptism should certainly be administered immediately if there is any reason for serious concern for the child's life. If the child is normal and healthy, canon 770 prescribes baptism as soon as possible. Some commentators deduce that baptism should therefore be administered from three to ten days after birth. Others, however, are more lenient and say that only for a serious reason should baptism be deferred beyond a month. From these two opinions it appears reasonable to say that baptism may be deferred for two or three weeks to meet the convenience of all concerned. To postpone it beyond a month would be seriously wrong unless a proportionately serious reason exists.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.Carm.

Analecta

Two thousand delegates to the Second World Congress on Fertility and Sterility heard the Holy Father on May 21 as he outlined the Church's teaching on various means of birth control and artificial insemination. With the realization that his words might possibly be misunderstood or misquoted if rendered in the vernacular, the Holy Father gave part of his address in Latin and the rest of it in French. He stated that the matter of sterility involves spiritual and ethical values for parents whose marriage is affected. They are forced to renounce the deeply human satisfaction of fatherhood and motherhood which is one of the greatest expressions of conjugal love. He then clearly reiterated the Church's teaching on the primary end of marriage, namely, the procreation of children. This end, he said, is superior to all others and certainly supersedes any physical satisfaction in the exclusive interest of the married couple. The child, he continued, is the friut of conjugal union involving not only organic functions and tender feelings but also a spiritual and disinterested love which accepts the responsibility of parenthood and the obligation to provide for the education of offspring.

Turning his attention in the same address to the subject of artificial insemination, the Pope rejected test-tube insemination as something absolutely immoral. He pointed out that the right to artificial insemination is not within the rights acquired by a couple in virtue of the marriage contract. Moreover, the right to it is not acquired or derived from the primary purpose of matrimony. He then explained that the right to this method of propagation is not acquired through marriage since marriage confers the right to "natural acts" capable of generating new life rather than a right to progeny. Consequently, artificial insemination is contrary to the natural law and to what is right and moral. On the other hand, he observed that medical attempts to facilitate the natural act need not necessarily be condemned.

Regarding sterility and fertility tests, the Holy Father stated that the direct taking of human seed outside the circumstances of legitimate union is to be condemned even in the light of simple,

rational ethics. Noe even the motive of scientific research can justify it. The right and power to exercise the procreative faculties are not acquired, he continued, by the fact of their existence but they are acquired only in a valid marriage.

Commemorating the 100th anniversary of the extension of the Feast of the Sacred Heart to the entire Church the Holy Father issued a special encyclical *Haurietis Aquas* and called the devotion to the Scared Heart a "true synthesis of the whole Christian religion." He points out also in this encyclical that the essential elements of the devotion, namely, "acts of love and reparation rendered to the infinite love of God for man—far from being defiled by materialism and superstition— constitute a form of piety which perfectly carries out a true and spiritual devotion, as was foretold by the Savior Himself to the Samaritan woman. . . . Therefore, it is not right to say that the contemplation of the physical Heart of Jesus hinders more intimate contact with the love of God, and that it retards progress of the soul on the path that leads to the possession of the highest virtues. We believe it opportune to give you anew this word of exhortation, so that you may promote this excellent devotion from which We expect most abundant spiritual fruits even in our times. . . . Moved by an ardent desire to set effective defenses against the evil designs of the enemies of God and the Church, and to return families and nations to the path of the love of God and neighbor, We do not hesitate to propose the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus as the most efficacious school of divine charity."

In an audience granted to the American Commission for Cultural Exchanges, the organization through which the American Fulbright Scholarships are administered, the Holy Father remarked upon the broad range of subjects studied and taught by the Fulbright scholars. He then emphasized the importance of cultural exchange programs such as the Fulbright scholarship plan, for in such exchanges one finds a means of balancing emphasis on materialism in the world today.

Speaking to seven thousand members of the Roman Organization of Domestic Servants on June 3, the Holy Father stated that they were entitled to proper employment benefits and Christian understanding from their employers. Through the law of Christian charity, the Pope said, they were brothers to the members of the

individual families they serve. In view of such a position, the Pope then expressed the wish that the employers act more like fathers than masters in their regard.

The Holy Father declared that there is today among the faithful a "religious will, a spiritual force and a sacramental life" of an intensity never before reached. The occasion was an address on Church law to a group of professors and students of the University of Vienna law school. The Holy Father observed that Canon Law is sometimes referred to as "juridical tyranny," particularly in the field of marriage legislation. To this false name the Holy Father answered by stating that many of the marriage laws have been instituted by Christ and that the Church has no right to change them. Canon Law, he said, is a necessary and natural development of the Church for "the sketchy laws of the apostolic era would not be sufficient today for a worldwide Church of over four hundred millions of faithful. For as often as the Church has spread geographically, or has reinforced her spiritual life or (so to speak) has sent forth another shoot, there has been almost spontaneously a development in her ecclesiastical law to rule and protect the free flow of that religious life." He then pointed to the codification of Canon Law at the turn of the century and called it an act in which the hand of Divine Providence is discernible since the codification at that time corresponded with the spread of the Faith and the internal development of the Church in the nineteenth century. Symbolizing the intimate connection of religious life in the Church with Canon Law whose supreme norm is the salvation of souls, the Holy Father reminded his listeners that it was St. Pius X who was the first to promote the idea of a new code of law while at the same time he was the one who "opened the fonts and the floodgates of the sacramental life." Canon Law, said the Pope, is not an end in itself but rather a means to a transcendent end which should contribute toward opening and smoothing the way to the truth and grace of Christ in the hearts of men. Although the Church is sometimes called rigid in the application of its laws, particularly those pertaining to the Sacrament of Matrimony, the Holy Father stated that the Church does proceed "in these matters without feeling, and with rigorous judgment as though she were indifferent to the tragedy that often occurs in some instances." Canon Law, he said, is not merely a human work but much of it is taken from the divine sources. This is but natural, he observed, for Christ founded

His Church "not as a spiritual movement without form, but as a well organized community."

On June 12 in an address to the 14th international congress of the Union of Editors which took place in Rome and in Florence, the Holy Father said that the aim of an editor should be one of enlightenment so that he will give readers what is needed most from the true, the good and the beautiful. He also indicated the desirability of legal restraints against harmful and obscene literature. Literature for children should be based on stories from the Bible rather than on ridiculous fantasies; and, he continued, one must not believe that everything is permissible in the adult field. An editor, said the Pope, must have respect for the reader, for truth, and for morals, so that he will publish those things alone which will have a good influence on the mind. "The greatest originality," he concluded, "to which an editor can aim is learning what the public need in the way of truth, goodness, and beauty, and discovering and encouraging talents which answer this deep-seated need of the human soul."

In an address to members of the Diocesan Retreat Movement of Barcelona, Spain, the Holy Father asked that the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius be practiced at the parish level by all Catholics Retreats, he said, are not reserved to those in cloisters or to those who seek to decide their status in life since everyone can derive great benefits from them. The exercises of St. Ignatius, he concluded, are readily adaptable to our times and still have benefits to offer which the world cannot take away from them.

On June 18 in a special message to the Catholic Women's League in London, the Pope told its members that womanhood and motherhood have a tremendous field for guiding the world to Christian decency. The message was read to 3,000 league members in the Royal Festival Hall in connection with the celebration of the golden jubilee of the league.

On June 23 the Pope urged members of the third International Congress for the Distribution of Food to promote an atmosphere of honesty and trust between producers, distributors, and customers. In doing so, he said, they can contribute to the stability of the whole social structure. It is their duty, he noted, to guard against all that might impair the atmosphere of honesty and trust

which should prevail between producers, distributors, and customers.

In connection with the 500th anniversary of the trial which vindicated St. Joan of Arc, the Holy Father stated on June 26 in a radio broadcast to those attending the reopening of the war-damaged cathedral of Rouen, France, that in this century of sensuality, materialism, and indifference, Joan of Arc should be a model to all. She points out the way, the Pope said, by which sanctity can certainly be attained. Her example, he concluded, should be eloquent in leading others in a life of Faith.

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.Carm.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

CONCEPT OF FREEDOM. Edited by Carl W. Grindel, C.M. Chicago: H. Regnery Company, 1955. Pp. xii + 512. $10.00.

This scholarly volume is an attempt on the part of St. John's University and the members of the Humanities Research Board to expose the true nature of freedom and examine its role in the different areas of knowledge. In his masterful introduction Dr. William E. Carlo lays the groundwork for the subsequent papers by considering in a general way the nature of knowledge and the relation of the different knowledges to freedom.

The first section of the book entitled, "The Metaphysics of Freedom," comprises a detailed analysis of the nature of freedom according to the metaphysics of St. Thomas. The opening paper, "Initial Freedom," by Joseph G. Scully offers a thorough examination of man's nature, his rational activity, and the relation of divine causality to created freedom. The second paper on the "Freedom of Autonomy" by Carl Grindel, C.M., treats of the difference between free will and free choice. "Freedom of the will is a quality that belongs to the will by its very nature as a spiritual faculty; freedom of choice . . . is a means only to the attainment of the fuller and more perfect freedom which the will must attain if it is to achieve its perfection." Much of this article is concerned with showing that man is truly free when he chooses those real goods that will perfect him as a person. The final paper on the metaphysics of freedom considers the subject: "Freedom of Thought." "Metaphysically considered the essence of the problem of freedom of thought is the relation of the mind to reality. Is the mind the measure of reality; or does reality measure the mind?" Following the sane teaching of the scholastics, Fr. Edward Farrell, O.P., brings out that the mind is measured and limited by reality or objective evidence. The degree to which the mind will be limited depends upon the force and clarity with which reality impresses itself upon the intellect. "Necessity in reality establishes the limits; contingency determines the proper field of intellectual freedom."

The second part of *Concept of Freedom* considers psychological freedom, that volitional activity which proceeds from within the agent but without being determined from within. Exceptional clarity and scholarship pervade the author's discussion of the conditions required for the exercise of psychological freedom. The mutual influence of

intellect and will in the production of a psychologically free act is treated with care and precision.

The third part of this book is devoted to a treatment of the limitations that ought to surround man in his communication with other men. Fr. John Burns, C.M., presents convincing arguments for the restriction of freedom in such fields as speech, radio, television, and comic books.

In the fourth part of *Concept of Freedom* leading authorities discuss the application of freedom to such vital subjects as government, law, international relations, economics, labor, education, and aesthetics. The reader will be refreshed by the calm, thorough, and scholarly discussion of these subjects—a welcome contrast to the confusion and verbosity which riddles these topics today.

"Freedom and Theology" is the subject of the fifth and final part of this volume. Very Rev. Francis J. Connel of The Catholic University of America presents the Catholic Church's teaching on such controversial questions as salvation outside the Catholic Church, freedom of conscience and worship, religious freedom and the state, and freedom of thought within the Catholic Church. Seldom will the reader, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, find the Church's teaching presented with such force and clarity. This article is bound to excite in the Catholic reader greater gratitude and joy for the faith he possesses. The non-Catholic will admire the fair and serene manner in which his objections are discussed and refuted.

In short, *Concept of Freedom* is a book long overdue. It is destined to dispel much of the confusion and shallow thinking that enmeshes the subject of freedom today. A debt of gratitude is due to the faculty of St. John's University for producing this splendid work on freedom.

KEVIN MCMORROW, S.A.

THE CALL OF THE CLOISTER. By Peter F. Anson. New York: Macmillan, 1955. Pp. xvi + 641. $8.50.

Mr. Anson, a convert himself from the monastery of Caldey in England, and a noted author of twenty-two other works (a list of which can be found in this, his latest), offers this present volume as "an up-to-date history of Anglican religious communities."

The Introduction serves as a bridge spanning the years between the Reformation and the monastic awakening which began in the middle of the nineteenth century. During the three hundred years following the disbanding and expulsion of the Roman monastic communities from

England in the time of Henry and Elizabeth, there existed no corporate monastic life in the Anglican Church although "there were nearly always individuals here and there who heard the call of the cloister and who longed to devote themselves to the service of God more closely . . . but [who] soon discovered that it was impossible for them to establish anything in the nature of a permanent community." These experiments in community living, as, for example, Nicholas Ferrar's establishment at Little Gidding founded in 1625, are very briefly recounted. As the nineteenth century approached the number of writers deploring the lack of monastic life in the Church of England increased. In 1829 the Poet Laureate, Robert Southey, aroused by the lamentable social conditions of his day and inspired by the example of the ministrations given to the poor by the Sisters of Charity in other lands, urged the establishment of Protestant Beguines in England. The monastic awakening was at hand.

In the body of his work Mr. Anson has written an account of the Anglican religious communities founded from the year 1842 until 1953. The first "monasteries" discussed are John Henry Newman's establishment at Littlemore and Father Faber's community at Elton. Mr. Anson then traces the history of the subsequent communities of men in Great Britain and Ireland. The life and works of Father Ignatius, O.S.B., the "erratic, roving recluse," the monk of Llanthony, who attempted to introduce the Benedictine manner of life into the Anglican Church, is related. Next in line is the story of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, founded in 1866 by Richard Benson. Commonly known as the Cowley Fathers, this community is the first religious body of men to have endured until the present day. There is a very excellent account of the Benedictines of Caldey Island, established in 1896 by Benjamin Carlyle, later Abbot Aelred, and of the monastery's conversion to Rome in 1913. The most recent community is the Servants of the Will of God, founded in 1953.

The various Sisterhoods are next considered, beginning with the Sisterhood of the Holy Cross, established in 1845 under the guidance of Dr. Pusey. Mr. Anson brings out the hardships and austerities of these pioneer convents and the misunderstandings they had to bear from fellow-Anglicans. They were regarded by the average Englishman as "Puseyite Nunneries" and "there were rumours that the ladies in black were 'disguised Roman Catholics.'" These early Sisterhoods were founded to combat the miserable social conditions of the age by engaging in such social works of mercy as "1. Visiting the poor in their own homes. 2. Visiting hospitals, workhouses, or prisons. 3. Feeding, clothing and instructing destitute children. 4. Assisting in burying the dead."